VOLUME V APRIL, 1910 NUMBER 2

# ITALIAN COURTESY-BOOKS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

THE native forerunners of the sixteenth century Italian courtesy-books are few and of little mark. But as an illustration of the headway made by Italy in domestic refinement, it is to be noted that while the first English treatise of this kind is of the date 1450, the first Italian one—or rather a courtesy-section of an Italian book—appeared two centuries earlier, in 1265. This is the speech of the Lady Courtesy in Brunetto Latini's *Tesoretto*. It is largely concerned with manners in conversation, a subject which in the sixteenth century courtesy-books was to be dealt with minutely. The rules given are commonplace, and include precepts for intercourse with equals, superiors, and inferiors, as in the following:

> I say first
> That in thy speech thou be circumspect;
> Be not too great a talker, and think beforehand
> What thou wouldst be saying[1].

Good usage, or conventional manners, are touched on, and the passage concludes:

> Therefore at all hours
> Hold fast to good usage, for that advances thee
> In credit and honour, and makes thee better,
> And gives fair seeming; for a good nature
> Becomes the clearer if it follows good habits.

True nobility and honour are touched on, and the conclusion is come to, as in most of the later treatises, that they depend not only on good birth but on a life of virtue, though if two men are equal in good deeds, the man of noble birth is the more esteemed. The section closes with varied advice for conduct in the street, on horseback, or in company: as, not to ride loose-reined, which is boorish; to lend when asked, and to be circumspect and modest towards women. The whole passage is a

[1] The translations are Mr W. M. Rossetti's, in his *Early Italian Courtesy Books* (Early English Text Soc., Extra Series, No. 8).

curiosity, and has little literary interest in the story of courtesy-books, but it contains hints as to the lines on which they were to develope.

*The Fifty Courtesies of the Table,* written by a cleric, Fra Bonvexino da Riva, is remarkable for the precision of its detail in one important aspect of good behaviour. It dates from 1290, and is in couplets. Historically interesting as being one of the first poems in the Milanese or Lombard dialect, it is also valuable in pointing forward to the *Galateo* in its treatment of table-manners. Each 'courtesy' is described in four lines, and the book includes, with rules, needless now by reason of advances in refinement, many precepts applicable at the present day. The ruling motive in behaviour should be a consideration for others such as is insisted on in the *Galateo.* For instance:

> Tell no bad news
> In order that those who are with thee may not eat out of spirit.
>
> Shouldst thou see in the viands
> Any disagreeable thing, tell it not the others.

The *Documenti d' Amore* of Francesco da Barberino, a long treatise of some 8500 lines, deals in much the same spirit with table-courtesies, and with the rules to be observed by servants when waiting at meals. But a second section treats of courtesy in general, with many canons of conversation. The idea appearing afterwards in the *Cortegiano,* that one's conduct should vary with time, place and circumstance, is developed here. Barberino's other work, *Del reggimento e dei costumi delle Donne,* discusses minutely a woman's conduct as maid, wife, or widow. So far, these treatises are crude in form, and unconcerned with the finer graces of life. The figure they paint is merely the ordinary well-mannered person, unadorned with the bodily graces and finer accomplishments demanded later from the model courtier.

Nearer to the *Cortegiano* both in subject and execution is Matteo Palmieri's *Vita Civile,* in which may be found the germs of much that Castiglione and his followers afterwards developed at length. The theme of the discourse is the education of a youth to take his place in the government of the State, and there are certain points of contact between the two works. Stress is laid on bodily exercise, 'In order to exercise the body, military sports, as mock fighting, jousting, and horseback riding, are valuable.' Letters are to be the basis of the youth's education, without which foundation all learning fails. The accomplishments of the youth are those of the courtier; knowledge of music, painting, sculpture and architecture, with a correct taste in their appreciation, are demanded by Palmieri. Following Aristotle

he requires the several virtues of Temperance, Courage, and Justice, and deals with Friendship in much the same spirit as Castiglione. Apart from these details, the *Vita Civile* is the only treatise in any measure worthy to be classed as a herald of the *Cortegiano* in expression. Omitting the lists of isolated rules of conduct which filled the earlier works, it is a closely knit and harmoniously developed dissertation, without, however, the artistic decoration of the *Cortegiano*.

The supremacy of this latter work is the more striking when we realise the dearth of native models and the crude nature of those existing. The *Cortegiano*, the Bible of the Renaissance courtier, did not come at the culmination of a literary movement; it was at once almost the first of its kind, and the finest. The aspiring courtier took it as his pattern, and, besides being the standard of cultured conduct, the work is among the foremost of those having any great influence on European literature in the period. Its author, Baldassare Castiglione, was one of the brilliant party of Urbinate courtiers whose life he paints so vividly; although by a modest fiction[1], he suggests that he was absent from the dialogues recorded in the *Cortegiano*. His career[2] and personality are typical of the soldierly man of affairs and scholar which is the special product of the Renaissance. Born at Casatico, in Mantuan territory, in 1478, he was sent—after a partial education from his parents—to the court of the Sforza at Milan. On his father's death, Castiglione returned to Mantua and entered the service of Gianfrancesco Gonzaga, by whom he was sent on an embassy to Milan, and afterwards, in 1503, to Rome. Here he met Guidobaldo, Duke of Urbino, whose train he joined, remaining till that prince's death. His military life began at Cesena, where he fought in the Papal forces against Venice. In 1506, after accompanying the Duke on various diplomatic missions, he went to England to receive the insignia of the Garter for his master. His stay was brief—from November 1, 1506 to February 9, 1507—and little evidence remains of his proceedings at the court of Henry VII. On his return he was made ambassador to Louis XII in Milan. Diplomatic offices, in fact, occupied his life; in the latter part of it he was ambassador to the Sacred College, while in 1524 Clement VII sent him into Spain to negotiate with Charles V. But his efforts to avert the sack of Rome were useless, and he died at Toledo in 1529.

[1] *Cort.*, I, 2: 'benché io non v' intervenissi presenzialmente per ritrovarmi...in Inghilterra.'

[2] For Castiglione's life, more especially in connection with the history of his time, the most recent and the best authority is Martinati, *Notizie Storico-Biografiche intorno al Conte Bald. Castiglione*, Firenze, 1890.

Cavalier in the best sense of the word, Castiglione inherited the spirit of his father Cristoforo, who had fought at Fornovo; diplomat and man of affairs, counsellor and friend of princes, he was the living embodiment of his own ideal figure. *Il Cortegiano* was conceived in 1508, but not published until 1528—a delay due to the constant polishing exercised upon it. The occasion of these dialogues was the visit of Julius II to Urbino on his way to Rome, in March, 1507[1]. He was received with jousts and pageantry, and the mingling of his train with the household of the Gonzagas in courtly intercourse gave the germ of the discourses composing the book.

In the evening, the gathered company sit at their ease in a circle, much as Boccaccio's men and women had done, and after choosing a leader, or 'queen,' proposed various questions as subjects for conversation[2]. Several are rejected, till that of Frederic Fregoso, Bishop of Gubbio, is finally chosen. 'I would have such a pastime for this night, that one of the company might be picked out who should take in hand to shape in words a good courtier, specifying all such conditions and particular qualities, as of necessity must be in him that deserveth this name[3].' Each aspect of the courtier's life is to be treated by a different speaker; his accomplishments, the circumstances in which he may display them, the nature of his services to the Prince, and what he may demand in return, are the chief divisions of the discourses; and the character of the court-lady, and the behaviour of courtier and court-lady when in love, are the chief minor themes.

The pattern courtier, then, must be 'a Gentleman born and of a good house[4],' since it is less likely that such a man would smirch by baseness the good name of his ancestors; he is furnished with an example such as the man of base origin lacks. This question of birth was to preoccupy all succeeding writers, who followed, in the main, the arguments of Dante. He, however, is inconsistent. While in the *De Monarchia* he accepts the Aristotelian definition of nobility as 'Virtue and ancient wealth[5],' and further affirms that 'Men are ennobled by merit of virtue, their own to wit, *or that of their forbears*[6]'; in the

[1] *Cort.*, I, 7: 'Passò per Urbino, dove quanto era possibile onoratamente, e con quel piú magnifico e splendido apparato che si avesse potuto fare in qualsivóglia altra nobil città d' Italia, fu recevuto.'

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *The Book of the Courtier*, tr. Hoby, in *Tudor Translations*, No. XXIII. London, 1900, p. 42. *Cort.*, I, 12.

[4] Hoby, ed. cit., p. 44. *Cort.*, I, 14: 'che questo Cortegiano sia nato nobile, e di generosa famiglia.'

[5] *De Monarchia*, II, 3.

[6] *Ibid.*

*Convito* he denies this. 'He errs who affirms ancient wealth to be the basis of nobility[1].' Again, in the canzone 'Le dolci rime d' amor,' on which the fourth part of the *Convito* is a commentary, he says, 'Nobility exists wherever Virtue is[2],' and 'Riches neither bestow Nobility nor take it away[3].' Castiglione, however, in the person of Canossa, seems to take it for granted that noble birth is essential in his ideal, and parries an objection with the Horatian reminiscence, 'It standeth with reason that good should spring of good[4].' In person he should be comely, neither too short nor too tall; of pleasing expression, and displaying 'a certain grace, and as they say, a hew[5].' This effluence of personality will affect favourably all with whom he comes into contact. It is the distinguishing mark of the cultured man, the essential difference lifting him above the common herd, and informing equally his gesture, exercise and intellectual accomplishments. The Renaissance realised the body's dignity, and the conception of the cultured man inevitably involved physical training. Hunting and tournaments, the sports most similar to serious war, will be his chief pastimes; he is to ride perfectly, fence, and have knowledge of the causes and conduct of duels, swim, leap, wrestle, and 'cast the stone[6].' All these are but to fit him for the one profession worthy the attention of the perfect courtier, that of arms[7]. This is constantly impressed; indeed, a courtier's excellence may be gauged by his prowess in the field[8].

But this is only one of the facets of a many-sided personality. The finer spiritual graces of the court are of equal weight. Intellectual occupations fitting him for the gentle intercourse of scholars and ladies, are to fill the time of relaxation from strenuous warfare and exercise. Here the new ideal of scholar-gentleman finds expression. Humane learning in all its branches is to be the basis of his culture; he is to be well acquainted with the Greek and Latin poets, orators, and historians, and with vernacular literature[9]. Drawing and painting are desirable[10], though not so essential as other accomplishments. The newer ideals of culture are now combining with older ones of utility, for, says Castiglione, these arts, besides being useful to the soldier in drawing

[1] *Convito*, IV, 2. [2] l. 101. [3] l. 49.
[4] Hoby, ed. cit., p. 47. Cf. Hor. *Od.*, IV, 4: 'Fortes creantur fortibus et bonis.'
[5] *Cort.*, I, 14; Hoby, p. 46.
[6] *Ib.*, I, 22.
[7] *Cort.*, I, 17.
[8] *Ib.*: 'Quanto più adunque sara eccellente il nostro C. in questa arte, tanto più sara degno di laude.'
[9] *Ib.*, I, 43—44. [10] *Ib.*, I, 49.

plans and perspectives of battlefields[1], assist him in appreciating natural scenery, and bodily beauties[2]. The group of courtiers gathered at Urbino were passionate lovers of artistic expression in any form, and being in constant touch with painters of merit, they became amateurs and connoisseurs of so exquisite a taste that they were sound critics and even advisers of the professional artist. Thus it is not strange that Castiglione desired painting and drawing among the courtier's accomplishments. Music, 'ease of the labours and medicines of feeble minds[3],' is necessary; and this may be understood when we remember how Urbino might almost be called the musical centre of Northern Italy. Castiglione's Duchess and her train both played and sang, while professed musicians were received into the circle of her friendship.

The courtier's conversation—a subject which was to provide matter for a separate treatise later[4]—is dealt with by Castiglione at such length and in such minute detail that it must be considered a very weighty element in cultured behaviour. Long passages are devoted to the language to be used[5], and to the comparative merits of archaic and modern vocabularies[6], while in a lighter manner are described in detail from Cicero the various kinds of wit worthy of being used by the courtier[7]. Sober and modest in dress, he must, as in all things, avoid extremes of severity and lavishness[8]. Finally, in morals the perfect courtier is a copy of Aristotle's virtuous man, endowed with prudence, liberality, courage, temperance, 'and all those attributes which belong to so honourable a condition[9].' These in brief are the chief ornaments of Castiglione's ideal figure. It remains to show how, and with what aim, they are to be used. The all-informing 'grace,' a thing not to be taught by rule, must accompany every action; affectation, the opposite vice, is the mark of imperfection. This affectation is really the anxiety to excel which sometimes appears, but which the true courtier resolutely conceals[10]. Thus the courtier will not play the lute like a professional, nor fight and joust as if he were a soldier of fortune. Everything is done with 'sprezzatura[11],' which makes each

[1] *Cort.*, I, 49: 'e massimamente nella guerra, per disegnar paesi, siti, fiumi, ponti, ròcche, fortezze, e tai cose.'

[2] *Ib.*: 'chè la machina del mondo...e nel mezzo la terra dai mari cinta, di monti, valli e fiumi variata.'

[3] Hoby, ed. cit., p. 89. *Cort.*, I, 47: 'riposo di fatiche e medicina d' animi infermi.'

[4] *Infra*, p. 10.

[5] *Cort.*, I, 29—39.

[6] *Ib.*, I, 30.

[7] *Ib.*, II, 43.

[8] *Ib.*, II, 27: 'non estremi in alcuna parte; che tendano un poco più al grave e riposato.'

[9] *Cort.*, I, 41: 'e tutte l' altre conditioni che a cosí onorato nome si convengono.'

[10] *Ib.*, I, 22; II, 7, 10, etc.

[11] *Ib.*, I, 22.

action appear one done as pastime[1], and success appear a matter of course. The one aim to be pursued is the honourable service of the Prince[2], and, incidentally, the good opinion of the ladies and knights with whom the courtier comes into contact[3]. The Prince himself, to whom he is attached, is as much honoured in receiving service, as the courtier is in serving. Castiglione dwells at length upon various aspects of this service; how far the commands of the Prince may be obeyed, what advice the courtier should give, and various details of his conduct when in the presence[4]. But in effect, it is almost suggested that the Prince and his court exist as a setting for the ideal courtier, rather than he for the court; for he is so supremely endowed with all the gifts of the perfect ruler as to throw into the shade both the Prince and every member of the circle in which he moves.

The court-lady is a companion picture to that of the courtier, and all the refinement and grace demanded in the one are equally requisite in the other[5]. When we consider the level which Renaissance culture had reached in the women of the courts of Mantua, Ferrara and Urbino, we feel that the figure is not overdrawn. Finally, a large part of the last book of the treatise is taken up with the subject of the courtier's love, and by a natural transition, the revived Platonism of Pico and Ficino finds, in Pietro Bembo, its foremost expositor.

Such is the bare skeleton of the *Cortegiano*. It remains to indicate why the book is one of the supreme documents of the Renaissance spirit and the reason of its enormous influence, both in its own department of literature and also generally. In the first place, it is the highest expression of that dominant note in the Renaissance—the discovery and exploration of man's intrinsic worth. The new type of soldierly scholar-gentleman, equally removed from scholastic pedantry and mere military prowess, became the ideal, and Castiglione's presentment of it in all its phases was also a guide to realisation. The *Cortegiano* included every aspect of the subject; theory and practice went hand in hand, so that succeeding treatises took as their text one or more of the book's divisions. Permeated as it is with classic influence, it is nevertheless far removed from the dry appeals to antique authority into which many of Castiglione's followers sink, for he had his being in exactly the surroundings he describes, and in an atmosphere charged with the transformed classicism of the Renaissance. Yet his actual

[1] *Cort.*, II, 10: 'faccia il nostro C. come cosa che sua professione non sia...né si conosca che molto studio o tempo vi metta.'
[2] *Ib.*, II, 7, 8.
[3] *Ib.*
[4] *Ib.*, II, 19.
[5] *Ib.*, III, 4 *et seq.*

classic debt is enormous, and he is quite conscious of it. The whole treatise, including its dialogue form, is modelled upon Cicero's description of the Orator. Indeed, the opening sentences of Book I may be closely paralleled by the introduction to the *Orator*[1]. Much of the discourse on 'Facezie' is direct translation[2], while the amatory advice given to the court-lady is Ovid in an Italian dress[3]. The Politics and Ethics are largely drawn on; the latter is the source from which Castiglione takes the moral excellence of the courtier. Classic illustration from the historians and elsewhere is used at every point, and the whole treatise is a mine of reminiscence of classic phrase or wording[4]. The Platonic colouring of Bembo's most fervid outbursts though largely from Ficino's commentary on the Dialogues, owes something also to the originals. In form, also, the *Cortegiano* is classic; its precedents are the dialogues of Plato, Cicero, and Lucian.

But the *Cortegiano* is supreme in its kind apart from the intrinsic value of the matter discussed. The delicate art displayed in painting the brilliant round of court-life in Urbino, and in portraying, by a few vivid strokes, the varied temperaments of the contrasted members of the household, links the discourses into an admirable whole. The frequent interruptions, by giving opportunity for rapid cross-fires of wit, retorts courteous and semi-serious abuse, the dramatic machinery asserting itself on occasion, as in the sudden arrival of the Papal Prefect in the midst of Cesare Gonzaga's balanced periods in praise of woman—these digressions, in addition to breaking the monotony of a long series of philosophic dissertations, help also to give a definite unity to the book. Indeed, it is upon this framework of the 'game' that Castiglione

[1] *Cort.*, I, 1: 'Fra me stesso lungamente ho dubitato, Messer Alfonso carissimo, qual di due cose piú difficile mi fosse; o il negarvi quel che con tanta instanzia piú volte m' avete richiesto, o il farlo.' Cf. 'Utrum difficilius aut maius esset negare tibi saepius idem roganti an efficere id, quod rogares diu multumque, Brute, dubitavi' (*Orator ad M. Brutum*, I, i). Also cf. I, i: 'Noi in questi libri' etc. and *Orator*, I, vi, 22: 'Non complectar in his libris amplius' etc.

[2] *Ib.*, II, 42, 43. Cf. 'Però, acciò non paia che in compagnia cosí degna' etc. with 'Quare Cæsar, ego quoque hoc a te peto' etc. (*Orat.*, II, 57); 'Le facezie e i motti sono piú presto dono e grazia di natura che d' arte' with [jocus et facetiae] 'quae, etiamsi alia omnia tradi arte possunt, naturae sunt propria certe, neque ullam artem desiderant' (*Orat.*, II, 54). Cf. 'e diventano insulsi' etc., 'est hominibus facetis et dicacibus difficillimum' etc. (*Ib.*, II, 54).

[3] *Cort.*, III, 50. Cf. 'Con silenzio di parole, ma con gli occhi che parlano';

'Atque oculos oculis spectare fatentibus ignem
Saepe tacens vocem verbaque vultus habet'
(Ov., *Ars Amandi*, I, 573—4).

Cf. 'Col viso afflitto e languido con quegli accesi sospiri, spesso con abundantissime lacrime';

Palleat omnis amans: hic est color aptus amanti. *Ib.*, I, 573—4.
Et lacrimae prosunt: lacrimis adamanta movebis. *Ib.*, I, 659.

[4] *Cort.*, I, 47, etc.

expended his greatest care, for it mirrors exactly the life of his circle; the diverse figures—cleric, scholar, artist, soldier, diplomatist, or cultured lady—with their prejudices and personal idiosyncrasies, are as real as similar figures in Shakespeare's higher comedies. The propriety with which parts are assigned to speakers is noticeable throughout. Pallavicino, who poses as woman-hater, keeps up a running fire of depreciation with Emilia Pia, the leaders of the 'game,' and with all who venture to grant any virtue in the sex. Bembo, whose dialogues on Love, *Gli Asolani*, had appeared in 1503, treats of perfect love and defends Letters as the highest courtly ornament. The grace and exquisite polish of the dialogue, the dignity of expression felt when the theme rises to towering heights as in Bembo's apostrophe to Love, the courtly sincerity of Castiglione's praises of the princes he had served, are all beyond praise. In conclusion, the *Cortegiano* is a lasting monument of the artistic splendours, the literary passion, and the intellectually refined intercourse of Italy's most glorious age.

The treatises following in the wake of the *Cortegiano* are all indebted to it, either for matter or for details of form. The first was *Il Nennio*[1], by Giovambattista Nenna of Bari, 'that famous doctor and worthy knight.' Its machinery is a curious combination of the dream-theme of the *Roman de la Rose* and its species, of the *Decameron*, and of the Provençal *tenzone*. The writer, fleeing with his friends from the plague in the 'city of Antenor,' arrives at an ancient city in Puglia, by the waves of the Adriatic. Falling asleep here one day, he dreams he is walking in a green valley when a troop of damsels and knights appears, led by a lady of sovereign authority, who advises him to flee the place before the arrival of the French. On waking, the narrator resolves to accept the advice, and with the friends of his circle retires to a country grange. Here they entertain Virginia, a noble lady, and her train, and on her departure she takes a gold ring, richly wrought, from her finger, and gives it as a prize to the man amongst her hosts who can prove himself the most noble. Possidonio and Fabricio, two of the company, undertake the challenge, agree to argue their claims, and appoint Nennio, a wise old man, as judge. At sunset therefore the party, pleasantly tired with hunting and hawking, descend to the garden and sit circlewise upon the thin grass.

The method adopted by Nenna in the discourses is simple. Possidonio brings forward all the arguments for noble birth being the essential cause of Nobility; Fabricio replies to them in order, and

[1] Venice, 1542, unpaged.

Nennio sums up and delivers judgment. As the general drift of the arguments is common to several treatises, it would be well to give them in brief detail. According to Possidonio, then, true Nobility is a quality left by famous ancestors as a hereditary gift to their descendants, for a man's valour illumines not only himself, but his sons and grandsons[1]. The analogy from animal creation, hinted at in the *Cortegiano*[2], is here expanded at more length: 'each species to which Nature has given power of reproduction, brings forth fruit in quality like itself.' A digression follows on the part played by woman in carrying on nobility of blood, but it is concluded that she is as much less worthy than man as matter is inferior to form. The subject of Letters is touched on; Possidonio declares them to be rather an added ornament than an essential cause of nobility. After enumerating his own possessions in houses and furniture, flocks and herds, silver and gold, he proceeds to develope the theme that, without wealth, mere nobility of birth is almost useless. 'Riches do away with melancholy, relieve every bodily ill, strengthen friendship, and make their owner's reputation the more brilliant[3].'

These are the chief points in Possidonio's plea; the following day, Fabricio proceeds to demolish them. He sets out with the argument of Dante concerning Adam. 'If Adam was noble, we are all noble; if he was "volgare e vile," so are we all[4].' But whereas Dante goes on to show that Adam was neither nobly nor ignobly born, Fabricio contents himself merely with the beginning of the passage as authority for his view. As black or white complexion is a bodily disposition, so true nobility is a hidden attribute of the mind. 'For of what advantage is it if noble blood is rendered nugatory by vice; and how can lowly birth affect individual virtue?' So in true nobility, there is no question of high or mean generation. Continuing, Fabricio takes Possidonio's arguments in turn, and presents a picture in heightened colours of the opposite view of the case. He eulogises learning; 'for who rules, who governs, who conducts the affairs of the world, if not the learned men? It is they who should be honoured, not the nobly born, bare of virtue and ignorant.' Wealth, again, is the root of evil, and the wealthy man's lot is not an enviable one. 'If he is eating, he fears poison; he fears war, he fears danger from water, air and fire; in short, fear is never absent from his mind.' Having thus disposed of Possidonio's arguments, he outlines his own ideal. Neither spacious palaces, fair

[1] Cf. *Cort.*, I, 14.
[2] *Ib.*, I, 15.
[3] Cf. *Cort.*, IV, 36.
[4] *Conv.*, IV, 2.

gardens, fertile fields, rich clothing, nor abundant gold and silver can bestow nobility, since they are but temporary gifts of fortune. Resplendent virtue, and that only, is the essential cause, 'for the attributes of the virtuous mind, since it is immortal, are themselves immortal.' Aristotle's ideal in the *Ethics* is the truly noble man, and an education in the Humanities is the means to realisation. 'I gave myself up,' says Fabricio, 'to the pleasing study of humane letters, where I gathered not only history and fables, but a knowledge of life.'

In giving judgment for Fabricio, Nennio divides Nobility into three main classes. First is that of birth, 'a certain quality proceeding from the noble blood of ancestors, continuing in the sons; and of the greater reputation among the vulgar according to its antiquity.' Nobility of the mind is the second kind: 'a glowing brightness which proceeds from virtuous action, rendering its possessor noble and illustrious.' The perfect Nobility, 'Nobiltà composta,' as being derived from two sources, is the third: 'a quality proceeding from the good birth of our ancestors, adorned with the good usages and praiseworthy virtues arising from our own minds.' As a subsidiary kind is Civil Nobility, bestowed by princes and kings, who may or may not allow it to be hereditary.

From this outline, it will be seen how the *Nennio* differs from the *Cortegiano*. It isolates and expands but one aspect of the subject, and ignores the graces and accomplishments demanded by Castiglione. The ideal figure is the virtuous man, considered individually, and never in relation to his surroundings and companions. The character is summed up by Nennio in his judgment as follows. 'The man born of noble blood must be wholly virtuous, wise, prudent, just and temperate; in conversation honest, free and moderate, since modesty in any action bestows grace. He must not be ambitious, proud, arrogant or haughty, since such things breed rancour, hate and disdain.' Except that humane learning and the Aristotelian virtues are required in the true nobleman, there is hardly a point of contact with the more worldly-gracious figure in the *Cortegiano*. But in form, *Il Nennio* is greatly indebted to it; the machinery is the same, with intervals of word-combat and quick retort breaking the tedium of the long philosophic discourses. Brisk descriptions of outdoor pastimes and short illustrative anecdotes are inset, and the whole is a very pleasing picture of Italian country life. Scholastic precision of reasoning takes the place of the high rhetoric of the *Cortegiano*, as for instance in Fabricio's argument logically defining true Nobility by a process of exhaustion. Constant reference to classical and Biblical authority occurs throughout. Aristotle's theory

of each virtue being a mean between two extremes is expounded at length. Fabricio bases much of his argument upon the lowly birth of the Apostles, Peter especially, and adduces the stock examples of Alexander and Philip of Macedon in illustration of the honours paid by princes to Letters. On the whole, *Il Nennio* is, in its limited range, comparable in style to the *Cortegiano*. Its language is lively and flowing, while at times it strikes a deeper note, as in the depreciation of riches and mere noble birth, in the catalogues of evils to which they give rise, and in the warm eulogy of learning. Many of its arguments are taken over bodily by successors, and it will be seen below how the same themes and the same illustrations reappear in later works.

From Nenna's theoretical considerations of nobility we turn to more practical affairs in the *Galateo* of Giovanni della Casa, a treatise in its kind of equal reputation with the *Cortegiano*. Its author was one of the polished clerics of the Renaissance, such as took part in the debates at Urbino,

> The courtly Christian, not so much Saint Paul
> As a saint in Caesar's household.

Of good Florentine stock, he was born, probably at Mugello, in 1503, studied law at Padua, and, after taking orders, was high in the favour of Cosimo I and of Alessandro Farnese, afterwards Paul III. In the latter's service he was Apostolic Commissary to Florence, and probably had some hand in the formation of the Academy. He became, in 1544, Archbishop of Benevento and Papal Nuntio to Venice, where he undertook much delicate business. During the pontificate of Paul IV he was Secretary of State, but died in 1557 during the negotiations preliminary to his receiving the cardinal's hat. Much of his work in prose and verse, Latin and Italian, was composed during periods of relaxation from clerical and diplomatic duties. 'Well read in humane letters, and more than ordinarily in divinity' is the verdict of Cardinal Pallavicino on this scholarly and courtly cleric.

*Galateo*[1], the best-known of his vernacular works, is a treatise on manners, and takes its name from what slight machinery it possesses. In Verona lived a bishop noted for his hospitality. Having entertained one day a certain Count Ricciardo, well-mannered except in one particular, that of noisy eating, he sends a courteous old gentleman, Messer Galateo, to accompany him on his departure. The discourse of the two provides the germ for the whole work.

[1] Venice, 1555.

Della Casa takes as his text the theory that customary usage is the rule to which all gentlemanly conduct should conform[1]. His business is to deal, not with the crimes of men, but with their errors in behaviour, since, though such virtues as fortitude and justice are necessary, the occasions for displaying them are less frequent than the every-day necessity for good manners. The fundamental law is that a gentleman must 'regulate and order his behaviour, not according to personal caprice, but to please those with whom he comes into daily contact[2].' This is insisted on throughout. 'I should wish,' he writes, 'our every action to show some reverence or respect for the company in which we are.' By this rule he measures all his code of behaviour. At table, his advice is generally that of the *Documenti d' Amore*; he shows how various discourteous acts offend one or other of the five senses. Points of conduct, as reading a letter in company, singing if one has an unmusical voice, are all referred to this standard. The question of clothes[3] is treated at some length, the rule being that a gentleman should always dress well, since otherwise it would appear as if he disdained his companions. But in addition, his choice of clothes must be determined by the region in which he dwells; in Germany, he will dress as the Germans do; in Italy, as the Italians. In conversation, again, it is necessary always to please; della Casa gives examples of subjects to be avoided. 'The material for your conversation should be neither vain nor unworthy[4]'; never such as to bring a blush to a girl's cheek, never blasphemy, or light speaking of God and the Saints. At table, the talk should be of pleasing things; no sad stories of plague and death should be recounted. Vainglorious boasting and the belittling of oneself are equally annoying to a man's companions.

A large portion of the treatise is taken up with Ceremonies, 'vain titles of honour and reverence towards him to whom they are applied[5].' They are of three kinds; those used to gain some benefit from a person, those useless and unnecessary, and those used in pursuance of general custom. Only the last kind are permissible, since 'they proceed not from our own inclination, nor from our own free judgment, but are laid down by law and common usage.' As for the other kinds, they are mere adulation[6]. In this connection, stress is laid on the differences in ceremonies in various States, and the consequent necessity of a man conforming to the custom of the country. 'Facezie' are discussed, and

[1] Ed. Italian Classics, 1803.
[2] Ed. cit., p. 144.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 158. Cf. *Cort.*, II, 27.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 169.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 181.
[6] *Ib.*, p. 191.

the kinds worthy of being used by a gentleman are pointed out. It is necessary that no shame, or scorn, or reproach should rest on any of the company, though from a joke, and grave matters must not be dealt with in a 'flyting' spirit. A gentleman should take heed to his choice of words; they should be easily understood, not obsolete, well-sounding, and reminiscent of no evil associations. Double meanings, indecent or bitter words should be avoided. Tales vividly related are acceptable in all company; and finally, a man, if he wishes to be distinguished in conversation, must make his voice neither strident nor rough. In general, the gentleman's every action is invested with a certain 'grace,' for 'grace is as it were a certain light shining abroad from well-ordered actions; without it, the good is not beautiful, and beauty is not pleasing[1].'

Thus the *Galateo* approaches nearer to the *Cortegiano* than to the *Nennio*. Abstract questions concerning virtue and the true nature of nobility are ignored; the author's aim is merely to make a man pleasing in company. The relatively light stress laid on the Aristotelian virtues by Castiglione is matched by della Casa frankly avowing their little importance in daily intercourse. But the gentleman of the *Galateo* is a more superficially polished personage than the ideal of the *Cortegiano*. Bodily and intellectual accomplishments are never mentioned, learning is not requisite, and the gentleman of the *Galateo* is the well-mannered man in a merely worldly aspect. In a way, the treatise goes back to the predecessors of the *Cortegiano*. Barberino's *Documenti d' Amore* supplies many of the rules of conduct at table and elsewhere, and though della Casa probably never saw the *Fifty Courtesies of the Table*, Bonvexino da Riva has a similar maxim to della Casa concerning sad stories at meals[2]. The classic element is, however, fairly large, the *de Officiis* of Cicero being used at many points. Dante and Boccaccio are also drawn upon for example and illustration.

The *Gentilhuomo*[3] of Girolamo Muzio (1571) is another abstract discussion of virtue and true nobility, somewhat on the lines of *Il Nennio*. Its foundations are chiefly Aristotle and Seneca, its framework a Socratic dialogue between Nobile, who upholds the claims of noble birth and ancient wealth, and Eugenio, the champion of virtue as the sole cause of true nobility.

The arguments are those common to Aristotle, Dante and Nenna; and naturally the same conclusions follow. Nobility 'is, as it were, a

[1] Ed. cit., p. 246.
[2] Cf. ante, p. 146.
[3] Venice, 1571, unpaged.

shining light proceeding from Virtue[1].' This is the text, and Eugenio hammers at it insistently. 'I must affirm and re-affirm that the true foundation of nobility is virtue.' 'Virtú,' according to Muzio, is simply an endowment of Aristotelian virtues, and he paraphrases the doctrine of the mean in illustration. 'Virtue is a certain habit consisting in mediocrity; and each separate virtue is a mean, of which vices are the extremes.' Dante's derivation of 'nobile' from 'non-vile' is rejected, and the correct one, 'notabile' ('worthy of being known,' by reason of virtue), substituted[2]. Unlike Castiglione, Muzio does not demand graceful bodily endowments in his gentleman; Horatius Cocles and Mutius Scaevola are given as examples in support of this.

Good birth has nothing to do with true nobility; it is desirable, 'but that only the nobly-born are endowed with graces, is surely not accordant to truth[3].' Here the degeneration of well-born men from the virtuous standards of their ancestors is illustrated by classic and contemporary examples. Riches, as in the *Nennio*, are discussed, and with the same conclusions. 'They make men neither noble, nor perfect of mind'; but though they are the root of evil, at the same time they are an aid to the virtue of liberality, if rightly used[4]. In this connection, the question is raised whether commerce is a fit occupation for the gentleman[5]. Muzio, probably with a direct reminiscence of the merchant-princes of Venice or Florence, declares that it is, 'so long as he uses his accumulated riches to good ends, for public and private benefit, by raising stately buildings, providing dowries for poor girls, aiding poor scholars, and keeping open and hospitable house.' Of the nobility of women, he merely remarks that they take rank according to that of their husbands. 'Marriage both bestows nobility on women, and takes it away[6].'

Among the various issues treated in passing is the old contest between Arms and Letters[7], and, as usual, Letters prevail, Muzio giving a long eulogy to the labours of literary men. 'Their labours are the more honourable, in that they are principally exercises of the mind, which is the principal part of a man, or even man himself; rather than exercises of the body, which is common to the beasts.' Again Muzio, like Nenna, attempts a classification of nobility, but recognises two kinds only. 'The first is natural nobility, the second civil. The former arises from perfection of nature, which is virtue;

[1] Venice, 1571, Bk I.
[2] *Ib.* Cf. Dante, *De Monarchia*, II, 3.
[3] *Ib.*, Bk I.
[4] Cf. *Il Nennio*, Bk I, ante, p. 154.
[5] *Ib.*, Bk II.
[6] *Ib.*, Bk II.
[7] *Ib.*, Bk III.

the latter belongs to families called noble, and ordinarily is conferred by princes or cities[1].'

Finally, may be cited Muzio's character-portrait of the ideal gentleman. 'An upright man, of gentle manners, clean-living and modest, not envious, nor evil-speaking; faithful to his sworn word, a lover of right and duty, loyal in the preservation of things placed in his care, whether money or secrets; lover of truth, and never departing from it, never consenting to evil; religious, and liberal as far as his estates permit; and, to sum up, an enemy of every vice and a friend of virtue[2].'

From this it may be seen how different Muzio's ideal is from that of Castiglione. To the latter, external graces and pleasing accomplishments are everything, while Muzio, evidently following Aristotle, describes the virtuous man and labels him 'gentleman.' Of advice on purely worldly conduct, of precepts to be followed in every-day intercourse, there is nothing, and the result is that while the 'Courtier' lives and breathes, the 'Gentleman' is a mere cold model and paragon of the moral virtues. Similarly in respect of style, while we forgive Castiglione his long and rather barren philosophical digressions for the clear descriptions of contemporary life and worthies, and for his passages of high-ringing rhetoric, the Aristotelian transcriptions of Muzio, his long lists of classic and biblical examples, and his incessant harping on the one string of virtue become wearisome enough.

The importance of conversation as a courtly accomplishment is shown in a whole treatise. This is the *Civil Conversation*[3] of Stephano Guazzo, published in 1575. The dialogue-form is still adhered to, though there are only two speakers—a knight, who in the opening defends solitude, and Annibale, who puts forward arguments for urbane intercourse. The knight praises monastic life, philosophic retreat, and the retirement of the ancient fathers from the world, for solitude is the one great aid to religious study, while conversation is merely a device to avoid divine contemplation. With better worldly wisdom, Annibale refutes such arguments and examples. The city, instead of being the home of all vice, was instituted to strengthen the hands of law and justice, and to make perfect a formerly dissolute life. He inveighs against such philosophers as, through mere laziness, have sought solitude in order to avoid the burden of civic responsibility. Having thus vindicated human intercourse, Annibale proceeds to lay down rules with regard to it.

In words very reminiscent of Castiglione, Guazzo states the purpose

[1] *Il Gentilhuomo*, Bk II. [2] *Ib.*, Bk II. [3] Ed. 1575, Venice.

of conversation to be 'to move people's affections,' and 'to acquire favour, good feeling, and grace.' To attain these ends, moderation must be always used[1]. Harshness of voice, obscure words and phrases, coarse colloquialisms and undignified gesture must all be avoided. Here the author pays his tribute to the *Galateo*[2], which, he says, has fully treated of these things; while, as Dante had done, he reviews the dialects of Italy and their defects. In the fashion of the old strings of precepts, miscellaneous advice is given on conduct in conversation: as not to interrupt, to be in no hurry to reply, to know when to refrain—for we have two ears, and only one mouth—to talk soberly and with reserve of things outside one's province, and to avoid disputes.

After these general remarks, Guazzo proceeds to outline the various things to be observed in conversation between nobles and commons, princes and subjects, clerics and laymen, and other classes. Here the chief interest for us is the digression on the causes of nobility[3]. Rejecting the three usually-accepted classes of Nenna and others, he makes three main divisions—semi-nobili, nobili, and nobilissimi[4]. Of the first class, there are further divisions: first, the noble by birth, having no real virtue, nor any appearance of nobility. The inevitable example of the degeneration of noble blood appears here again; for families, like fruit-trees, become sterile, and slaves may be descended from kings. Second are those ennobled by virtue, and—in so far as the mind is a nobler part of man than the body—so these are noble in a correspondingly higher degree than the first class. Third are those ennobled by the custom of a country or town, as soldiers and rich merchants, who are not esteemed really noble except in the State which confers their honour. The 'nobili' are those in whom noble birth joins with virtue, for high birth unaccompanied by learning and moral worth is no more than the body deprived of the soul. Nobility, indeed, is the daughter of learning, and knowledge confers it no less than valour in arms. But the 'nobilissimi,' the perfectly noble, are those 'who to nobility of birth and virtue add riches and magnificence, which aid greatly to the preservation and support of nobility,' although they cannot of themselves make a man noble.

After this digression, Guazzo returns to his main subject, conversation, beginning with that of nobles and commons, and princes and their subjects[5]. Princes and nobles should show themselves

[1] Ed. 1575, Venice, p. 160. [2] *Ib.*, p 171.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 220. Cf. *Nennio*, Bk II; *Gentilhuomo*, Bk II.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 226 *et seq.* [5] *Ib.*, p. 259. Cf. *Cort.*, IV, 18 *et seq.*

humane, gracious, and civil, and by their speech and actions prove the nobility of their minds; while inferiors should know and acknowledge their inferiority, and not arrogate nobility to themselves. Subjects should, if possible, avoid conversation with their prince, but if invited, they should be careful how they bear themselves, neither haughtily nor arrogantly. Indeed, the greater the favour and attention they receive from the prince, the more reverently and humbly must they comport themselves. If entrusted by a prince with high office, commoners must never, whether through fear or through hope of advancement, consent to injustice, much less propose such a course. This is evidently a reminiscence of Castiglione's passage on the courtier's duty in advising the prince. In treating of the conversation between learned and ignorant persons, Guazzo insists again on the nobility of letters, adducing, like all his predecessors, their power in conferring immortality, with the classic instance of Petrarch's sonnet on Alexander at Achilles' tomb. A digression on ceremonies follows, in which he shows the absurdity of many people whilst using them. Rightly conducted, however, ceremony begets goodwill in friends, and shows a man to be civil and urbane. Finally, to converse well it is necessary to be candid and sincere, without any veil of deceit.

In passing, Guazzo discusses the two kinds of love, while treating of conversation between man and woman. In a passage evidently modelled on Bembo's oration in the *Cortegiano*, he describes the effect of lust[1]; 'it begins in fear, is carried on in sin, and ends in pain and annoyance,' while pure love, platonic love, 'the desire for the beautiful,' is 'life's most perfect ornament.' The last book of the treatise is a pattern conversation between five men and five women at the court of Casale, in which one lady is made Queen, and a 'game' proposed. The conversation is on subjects as varied as love and drinking, rules of health and contentment with one's lot, while lively quips and repartee fly back and forth.

The *Civil Conversation* brightly written, not overburdened with classic or biblical instances, is a worthy follower of the *Cortegiano*, upon which it is obviously based. The machinery, however, is less interesting; there is no dramatic element, no lively description of contemporary manners, and as the whole burden of the discussion is borne by one man, there is no opportunity for brisk dialogue or witty word-play. At the same time, it avoids the long and often dull philosophic digressions of the type of the *Gentilhuomo*. It is probably

[1] Ed. 1575, Venice, p. 300.

a true picture of sixteenth century Italy, where urbane life had reached a pitch of perfection unattained by other countries of Western Europe, while its popularity is shown by the number of editions and translations which followed its first appearance.

With the exception of a few semi-technical treatises on the Duel and the Art of War, which are only 'Courtesy-books' in part and incidentally, the last of these more general works is the *Discorsi* of Annibale Romei[1], of Ferrara, a man of whom little is known except that he served under Guidobaldo II, and was his ambassador to Gregory XII. The dialogues of which the book consists are supposed to take place at the seaside retreat of the Ferrarese court in 1584, and the speakers are the actual courtiers. Except for the fact that the subjects of discussion are more definitely marked off from each other than in the *Cortegiano*, the *Discorsi* is the nearest approach in spirit and execution to Castiglione's work. Divided into seven 'giornate,' each recording the conversation of one sitting, the book includes practically every subject of which previous writers had treated, though they do not preserve the more natural and spontaneous order of the *Cortegiano*. It may be better, therefore, to speak of them rather out of their actual sequence.

The fifth 'giornata[2]' is taken up with a discussion of nobility, and after various opinions, including those of Muzio and Aristotle, have been brought forward, they are dismissed as either wrong or not wholly inclusive of the necessary attributes of nobility. As in the *Cortegiano*, birth from noble ancestry is regarded as essential; indeed, three generations of noble blood are necessary to make a man noble. 'Thus, for a man to be noble, it is necessary that, besides his own splendour, he should have that of at least three predecessors in his family[3].' Riches and magnificence are, however, also desirable. But the really noble man, in addition to good birth, must have other and finer attributes. The humane studies, bodily exercise of all kinds, the art of war, and the study of law, are all necessary to his aim, which, in short, is the service of his country[4]. Merchants, granted they are of noble birth, may also be accounted truly noble if their trade does not interfere with their occupation of liberal study, and so long as it is carried on by agents. The old idea of the merchant-prince being a public benefactor is again expressed; the aim of a trader, if he desires to be noble, must always be the good of his country, rather than his

[1] Venice, 1585. Ed. Angelo Solerti, in *Ferrara e la Corte Estense*, 1900.
[2] Ed. cit., p. 184. [3] *Ib.*, p. 192. [4] *Ib.*, p. 199.

own private profit[1]. The nobility of woman is touched on, and opinion is divided as to her comparative worth.

Honour, a subject not much regarded before, except in the treatises concerning duelling, is the matter of the third day's discussion. It is here defined, with a hint of the chivalric code, as 'that ardour which urges the human mind to do glorious deeds, and which makes it brave against its enemies[2].' It urges the true gentleman to redress injuries, and even to undertake unjust quarrels, if otherwise he would become dishonoured. Once lost, it is never regained, for to be honoured involves the opinion that one has never failed in valour or justice.

The fourth day's discussion is on the subject of the Duel, and resolves itself into an examination of the generally accepted rules and an ethical explanation of them. The conclusion is that single combat is unjust and repugnant to all law, human and divine; it is unnatural, as it destroys instead of preserving, and irrational, as it sets out to prove truth by means of mere physical strength.

The conclusion of the sixth discussion, on 'Riches,' is the common one, namely, that they are not only an instrument of happiness, but also the chief worldly good and a predisposition to virtue.

The seventh day's subject is the oft-discussed one of the precedence of letters over arms. Here the respective sides are taken by Patrizio and Brancaccio, the latter being a veteran in the service of Ferrara. The trend of Patrizio's argument is, that happiness being man's true end, and intellect being the means by which that end is attained, the profession which demonstrates to mankind the functions of the intellect is more noble than one which depends entirely on bodily force. The reply to this is made up of the stock arguments so often met with before, such as the necessity of a long war to ensure a lasting peace, and the more frequent deification of soldiers in antiquity.

The first two 'giornate,' in conclusion, are highly rhetorical paraphrases of the Platonic theories of beauty and love, evidently inspired by Bembo's oration in the *Cortegiano*. They are of interest as having many points in common with Spenser's *Hymns*.

A group of semi-technical works, 'courtesy-books' only so far as they deal in places with nobility, honour, and kindred subjects, remains to be treated. Among them are three by Domenico Mora, a Bolognese soldier in the service of Poland, in which the writer is at pains to defend the profession of arms against that of letters. *Il Cavaliere*[3],

[1] Ed. cit., p. 201. Cf. *Gentilhuomo*, Bk II. [2] *Ib.*, p. 50.
[3] Vilna, 1589.

the last of these to appear, is avowedly a reply to the *Gentilhuomo* of Muzio, but the other two, the *Tre Quesiti*[1] and *Il Soldato*[2], also bear some hand in the dispute. They may, however, be dismissed summarily. In them, Muzio's arguments are taken in order, and refuted. As becomes one 'who has not made Letters his profession,' Mora argues very simply, and chops little logic; his statements go straight to the point. The greater part of these two books is purely technical, treating of tactics and fortification.

*Il Cavaliere* is, however, much more interesting in its delightfully sweeping judgments and its downright, uncompromising statements. Mora is no philosopher, but a keenly observant soldier who has seen that ancient birth, wealth, and the nobility acquired by martial service go a long way in bringing a man to high honour. And so these are his requirements for the character of the gentleman. 'Indeed, I would go so far as to affirm that a man born of an honoured house, should be always reckoned noble[3].' Taking a poll of the nations of Europe, he finds that the majority of them regard wealth as the supreme happiness, rather than knowledge or abstract virtue. Therefore his conclusion is that 'it is riches that make men noble, for nothing makes a man so ridiculous or so much despised as poverty[4].' This is by way of introduction; Mora proceeds to outline the character of the true knight, and to show how supreme nobility is found in him. 'I affirm without hesitation that every perfection which should and can exist in an honourable gentleman is to be found in the valorous soldier[5].' He accounts for the decay of Italy by pointing to the disrepute into which the military art had fallen, and to the accompanying reliance on letters, which had made her a prey to native and foreign destroyers.

The old, much-debated case of the power of Rome was one eminently adapted to serve the ends of either party in the dispute between Arms and Letters; Muzio had cited it, and Mora does so to support the opposite view. Rome, he says, was mistress of the world 'by reason of the valour of men she bore and fostered, as Caesar, Pompey and Sulla, and not through the knowledge of Cicero and Sallust[6].'

As a partial contrast to Castiglione's ideal lady, we may set Mora's description of the woman he desires to mother his perfect knight[7]. She must manage her house well and honourably, dispensing daily the needful articles to servants and dependents. Her children are to be brought up in the fear of God; they are to be well-mannered, cultured,

[1] Venice, 1567. [2] Venice, 1570. [3] *Il Cavaliere*, p. 29.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 9. [5] *Ib.*, p. 40. [6] *Ib.*, p. 105. [7] *Ib.*, p. 123.

and gracious in every way. She herself is to cause scandal by none of her actions, neither in dress, conversation, nor in any of her daily proceedings. Thus her virtues are purely domestic; she need have none of the polished graces of Castiglione's court-lady.

Of this group, there remains to be noticed *Il Duello*[1], a treatise widely known in Europe in its day, and frequently quoted, alluded to, and translated. It was the accepted text-book and work of reference for all nice points of the duelling code; but apart from this, it is also a valuable contribution to the literature of honour and the true nobility. Though confused in plan, philosophic digressions following lists of minute regulations for the ordering of duels, *Il Duello* is nevertheless interesting both intrinsically and for its vogue in England. In brief, its contents are these. A definition of the duel opens the work; it is 'a fight, body to body, to determine the truth[2].' The causes of quarrel, the technical 'lie' and its species, the method of challenge and reply, the etiquette to be observed by both challenging and challenged parties, and a description of the arms permissible, are given in order[3].

[1] Venice, 1551. [2] *Ib.*, p. 8 b. [3] *Ib.*, p. 56 b.

JAMES W. HOLME.

LIVERPOOL.

# YARINGTON'S 'TWO LAMENTABLE TRAGEDIES[1].'

'Two Lamentable | Tragedies. | The one, of the Murther of Mai- | *ster* Beech *A Chaundler in* | Thames-streete, and his boye, | done by *Thomas Merry.* | *The other of a Young childe mur-* | thered in a Wood by two Ruffins, | *with the consent of his Vnckle* | By Rob. Yarington. | LONDON. | Printed for *Mathew Lawe,* and are to be solde at | *his Shop in Paules Church-yarde neere vnto* | *S. Austines Gate, at the signe* | *of the Foxe.* 1601.'

So runs the title-page of an Elizabethan play, exceedingly crude in form, and little known to-day[2]. Nevertheless for several reasons this play deserves attention. Its first plot, the murder by Merry of Beech and his apprentice, Winchester, is the occasion for a seemingly exact representation of an actual crime that occurred in London, in August, 1594. Before the eyes of the audience Merry slays Beech and Winchester with a hammer. Then to conceal his crime he cuts up Beech's body on the stage, and places certain fragments in a sack, which he conceals, hiding the other parts elsewhere. The audience later on has the pleasure of seeing these mangled limbs fitted together to make 'among them all a sound and solid man.' Merry and his sister are finally arrested, tried, and actually hanged on the stage. Remembering that contemporary records prove these events to be historical, I do not know any play which presents more literally one side of the life and interests of the London populace during Shakespeare's young manhood.

The second tragedy, scenes of which alternate with those of the first, is unconnected with the Merry plot except through the Induction and Choruses between the acts. Its story is essentially that of 'The Babes in the Wood' with two important differences. Only one child, instead of two, is murdered by order of the cruel uncle, and the scene is laid in Italy, not Norfolk. Thus the dating of the play involves the history of the ballad licensed on October 15, 1595.

[1] Frequently referred to by the running head of the text, *Two Tragedies in One.*

[2] It would probably be inaccessible to modern students of the drama had not Mr A. H. Bullen reprinted it in his *Old English Plays,* Vol. IV, on which reprint this study is based.

A third subject of interest in the play is the nature of the stage directions. These chiefly concern the Merry tragedy, and imply that both the upper and the lower story of Merry's residence, as well as Beech's shop on the same street, are simultaneously represented on the stage[1]. Some of the most remarkable of the directions follow:

*Merry begins to cut the body, and bindes the armes behinde his back with Beeches garters; leaves out the body, covers the head and legs againe*[2].

*When the boy goeth into the shoppe Merrie striketh six blowes on his head and with the seaventh leaves the hammer sticking in his head; the boy groaning must be heard by a maide who must crye to her Maister. Merry flieth*[3].

*Bringes him forth in a chaire with a hammer sticking in his head*[4].

The absolute realism of one of these plots and the intrinsic interest possessed by the other, together with the nature of the stage directions, then, will form my apology for seriously discussing the date and authorship of a play admittedly gruesome and crude beyond redemption.

## I.

The most recent word as to the composition of this curious drama has been said by my friend, Mr W. W. Greg, in his excellent edition of *Henslowe's Diary*[5]. Mr Greg there shows that certain entries of broadside ballads in the Stationers' Register for August and September, 1594, prove Merry's murder of Beech and his servant to have taken place on August 23, 1594. He also notes, as had been previously pointed out by Fleay and other scholars, that several payments made by Henslowe in 1599 and 1600 to the playwrights, Day and Haughton, for 'Thomas Merry' or 'Beech's Tragedy' evidently had to do with the incidents of this crime. Again following Fleay, Mr Greg calls attention to Henslowe's payments about the same time to Chettle for the 'Orphans' Tragedy,' and to Day for some nameless 'Italian Tragedy.' Mr Greg's theory as to the composition of the play bearing Yarington's name is slightly modified from that of Fleay. It is that the Merry portion of the *Two Lamentable Tragedies* was originally written by Haughton and Day; that the other part was the joint product of Chettle and Day. But as 'there is certainly no trace of [Day's] hand now remaining,' Mr Greg continues, 'I conjecture that Day contributed

[1] Dr G. F. Reynolds touches on these and other points in the play in the course of a suggestive article 'Some Principles of Elizabethan Staging,' *Modern Philology*, II, pp. 581—614; III, pp. 69—97.

[2] Bullen, p. 46. [3] Bullen, p. 31. [4] Bullen, p. 39.

[5] Pt II, *Commentary* (London, 1908), pp. 208 f.

a more or less independent underplot to each, and that these were dropt when the main plots were amalgamated.' The amalgamation, he supposes on the basis of another payment by Henslowe, was the work of Chettle, though from the style of the Induction, that part may 'have originally belonged to *Thomas Merry*, and have only been altered by Chettle to fit the composite play. The piece as we have it was certainly copied out, and to some extent edited by one hand, for the curious direction "to the people" for "aside" occurs in both parts, and certain peculiarities of spelling run throughout. These are due, I believe, not to Chettle, but to Yarington, the scribe, as I take it, who placed his name at the end of the MS. whence it found its [way] on to the title-page[1].' Then Mr Greg courteously refers to the fact that my own conclusions are different from his, but have not yet been published.

In other words, if I understand him aright, Mr Greg thinks that this excessively crude play, marked on its title-page and at its end with the name of Rob. Yarington, is primarily not Yarington's work at all, but the composite product of four men, three of them experienced playwrights; and, further, that most or all of that written by the best one of these dramatists was dropped from the play in the amalgamation of its two chief plots. On its face such a complex theory, even though tentatively suggested by a scholar of Mr Greg's standing, will not readily be accepted.

## II.

One may surmise that two reasons have led Mr Greg to the position just stated. The first is a desire to explain the successive payments of Henslowe, on behalf of the Admiral's company of actors, to Day and Haughton from November 21 to December 6, 1599, for 'Thomas Merry' or 'Beech's Tragedy'; and also certain payments made about the same time, on behalf of the same company, to Chettle for the 'Orphans' Tragedy[2].' The second reason is that Mr Greg sees in the printed *Two Lamentable Tragedies* certain marked stylistic differences between the two plots.

That Day and Haughton wrote for the Admiral's men a tragedy on the subject of the murder of Beech by Merry, that they completed the

[1] *Henslowe's Diary*, Pt II, p. 209.

[2] I cannot myself see why much should be made of the fact that Day (not Chettle) was then being paid for 'a nameless "Italian tragedy."' Surely Italian tragedies were common enough in that day to obviate necessity for this identification with the second plot of the Yarington play. *Romeo and Juliet* or *Othello*, to go no further, might have been so described by Henslowe.

play, and that it was licensed the next month[1], cannot be disputed. But that this tragedy is identical with the Merry portion of the Yarington play is evidently questioned even by Mr Greg, who sees that that part is not long enough alone to form a complete play, and can find 'no trace of [Day's] hand now remaining' in either plot. Hence comes the somewhat implausible suggestion that Day's 'more or less independent underplot' was dropped out of the play later. It is by no means certain that Chettle's 'Orphans' Tragedy' treats the second theme of our play[2]. But granting that Chettle was writing a play, or part of a play on the subject of the 'Babes in the Wood,' the record of Henslowe indicates that he received for his work far less than did Day and Haughton, even though he is supposed to have amalgamated the two plots. But the record does not show that his tragedy was ever licensed, or even finished. A more natural inference is that Chettle never completed the play for which he received these sums in advance, and what we know of Chettle's character does not destroy the suspicion.

In arguing as to style Mr Greg appears to be surer of his ground. He says: 'In the extant play it is evident that the two plots are the work of different writers, though I cannot trace more than one hand in each as one would expect to from Henslowe's entries....The Merry part is written in an extraordinary wooden bombast of grotesque commonplace, which it would be difficult to parallel except from some broadside ballads, and which one may well hesitate to father on any one. I suppose, however, that it must have had an author, and of Haughton's work we know little. The "Orphans" part, though feeble enough, is much better written, the author having feeling and some notion of poetry. He actually uses rime and classical allusions, both of which are wholly foreign to the style of his collaborator. There is plenty of rant but it is upon more promising subjects than privies and ditches. On the whole it is quite good enough to be by Chettle[3].'

On such a subject one must allow for the personal equation. Now in reading the play I do not feel to such an extent as does Mr Greg, these supposed differences in style between the two parts. Several passages in the Orphan tragedy, like the hunting scene of the Duke and his companions near Padua, Allenso's lament over Pertillo's corpse, and the dialogue between the disguised shepherds, strike a higher note,

[1] They were paid 'in full, £5' on December 6, 1599. Henslowe paid seven shillings for licensing the play in January. Greg, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

[2] I am informed that there exists a thrilling American 'dime novel' entitled, *Seven Buckets of Blood, or The Orphan Hack-Driver's Revenge*. Such a story might have furnished Chettle with his theme and title. The orphans are always with us.

[3] p. 209.

I admit, than do any parts of the Merry tragedy. But it is somewhat easier to treat imaginatively, even poetically, the incidents connected with the slaying of an innocent child in Italy at some indefinite time, than the widely discussed events of a certain notorious, brutal murder of a shop-keeper which has recently taken place in the very city where the drama is to be acted, and the subsequent events of the hanging, witnessed by many spectators of the play.

That certain passages in the two plots are not wholly unlike in style must be acknowledged by any one who has read the concluding scene to each tragedy. The situations in both are very similar. In each case not only the murderer but an innocent relative who has helped to conceal the criminal after his act, is condemned to execution. All four culprits in long laments, precisely in keeping with the style of the broadside ballad, acknowledge their sins, pray God for forgiveness, and announce their readiness for death.

There are further resemblances of style. Let the following passages be compared. The first five lines below are taken from the Merry portion of the Yarington play, concluding Act iv, Scene 5. The second quotation, beginning Act iv, Scene 6, is from the Orphan tragedy, but immediately follows the first in the printed play. I think I distinguish the same writer in both.

1.

*Rachel.* Rest still in calme secure tranquillitie,
And over-blowe this storme of mightie feare
With pleasant gales of hoped quietnesse.
Go when you will; I will attend, and pray
To send this wofull night a cheerfull day.

2.

*Fallerio.* Passe ore these rugged furrowes of laments
And come to plainer pathes of cheerefulnesse;
Cease thy continuall showers of thy woe[1].

To the Orphan plot Mr Greg has done more than justice in his comments on it. Two or three more quotations from one scene in this part of the Yarington play will not gratify æsthetic tastes, but may serve to show that its rant is on no more elevated subjects than is that of the Merry tragedy:

1 *Mur.* Grace me no graces, I respect no grace,
But with a grace, to give a gracelesse stab;
To chop folkes legges and armes off by the stumpes,
To see what shift theile make to scramble home;
Pick out mens eyes, and tell them thats the sport
Of hood-man-blinde, without all sportivenesse[2].

[1] Bullen, pp. 70 f. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

You are too shallow; if you gull me so,
Chop of my head to make a Sowsing-tub,
And fill it full of tripes and chitterlinges[1].

2 *mu.* Feare not, sweet child, he shall not murther thee.
1 *mu.* No, but my sword shall let his puddings forth[2].

1 *mur.* Swoones, I am peppered, I had need have salt,
Or else to morrow I shall yeeld a stincke
Worse then a heape of dirty excrements[3].

Of the Merry plot Mr Greg states that rime is 'wholly foreign to the style' of the author. Surely this assertion was a slip, for rimed couplets are not infrequent in that part of the play[4]. Examples follow:

Then since no meanes can make my sorrowes lesse,
Suffer me waile a woe which wants redresse[5].

I would endevour all my comming dayes
To please my maker and exalt his praise[6].

*Cow.* Why, now you fall into your auncient vaine.
*Wil.* Tis vaine to urge me from this silent vaine;
I will conceale it, though it breed my paine[7].

Indeed, so far from agreeing with Mr Greg that the two plots are evidently the work of different authors, I can find no sufficient evidence to support his theory, but much to show the same bungling, inexperienced hand in both parts.

A more positive objection, however, to this theory of composition seems to have been entirely overlooked by Mr Greg, as well as by Fleay. The Induction to the printed play, in alluding to the two murders involved, reads:

The one was done in famous London late,
Within that streete whose side the River Thames
Doth strive to wash from all impuritie.....
The most here present, know this to be true[8].

Later on the Chorus refers to the hanging of Merry and his sister, about to be enacted on the stage:

Your eyes shall witnesse of their shaded tipes
Which many heere did see perform'd indeed[9].

Now to my mind the inference is clear that these lines were written very soon after the murder and the execution, when the events were fresh in the minds of London citizens. But entries in the Stationers'

[1] Bullen, p. 49. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 51. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[4] Mr Greg likewise declares 'classical allusions' wholly foreign to this author's style. But he says that 'the Induction...rather resembles the Merry part in style.' Yet we have in the Induction and Choruses references to Elisium, Alcides, Zoilus, and Tantalus.
[5] Bullen, p. 61. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 70. [7] *Ibid.*, p. 78.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 9. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 86.

Register, cited by Mr Greg, show that the murder occurred August 23, 1594, and the execution of the Merrys on September 6, 1594. Day and Haughton, however, did not write *Thomas Merry* until the end of 1599, and it was 1601 before Chettle composed these choruses, if it was he who 'effected the conjunction' between the two plots. Considering the frequency of murders and executions in London at that time, I cannot believe that the language quoted alludes to events more than six years past.

Until stronger evidence to the contrary is presented, my own conviction will remain that the play as we have it was written in the latter part of 1594 by Rob. Yarington, the author named on the title page. To paraphrase Mr Greg's words, 'One may well hesitate to father [the *Two Lamentable Tragedies*] on any one. I suppose, however, that it must have had an author, and of [Yarington's] work we know little'—in fact, nothing at all beyond this play. But to compose even the 'Babes in the Wood' part would not require extraordinary genius.

It is not the primary purpose of this paper to interpret the entries in Henslowe. In my opinion neither Day's nor Haughton's work is preserved under Yarington's name. I believe they wrote another tragedy on this subject, perhaps a revamping of Yarington's earlier work. Chettle may have had as his task the revision of the second plot, though that is doubtful. No one acquainted with the history of Elizabethan quartos will think it strange that a play written in 1594 was not printed till 1601. The manuscript probably did not fall into the printer's hands until the later date.

The section which follows is in no wise dependent on what has gone before, but it is believed that it will strengthen the case for conclusions already reached.

## III.

In April, 1594, as we learn again from *Henslowe's Diary*, a play of 'kinge leare' was acted for several nights by 'the Quenes men & my lord of Susexe to geather[1].' Presumably it was the same play, registered as the 'historye of Leire kinge of England and his Three Daughters,' by the printer, Edward White, on May 14 of that year[2]. This latter date will be noted as more than three months before the night of the murder on which the Merry tragedy is based. Unfortunately no copy of White's 1594 edition of the *Leir* is preserved to us, but among those

[1] *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. Greg, I, p. 17.
[2] Arber's *Transcript of the Stationers' Register*, II, p. 649.

who have investigated the subject there is unanimous agreement that the anonymous *Leir* play printed by Stafford for Wright in 1605 is really that which was on the stage and registered in 1594[1]. Hence, regardless of all theories as to authorship of either play, we may feel reasonably certain that the *Leir* as printed was written at least several months earlier than the Merry part of the *Two Lamentable Tragedies.*

Now a year or two ago I called attention to the fact[2] that one unusual line is common to both these plays. The line runs:

Ah, do not so disconsolate your selfe[3].

The peculiar use of the verb would render futile any contention that the identity of the two lines is fortuitous. Personally I have no doubt that Yarington took the words from the earlier play.

But the line in question occurs in the Merry portion of the *Two Lamentable Tragedies.* Between certain lines from the Orphan tragedy and other lines from the *Leir* the similarity is scarcely less marked. This fact will be best brought out by the use of parallel columns:

| *Two Lamentable Tragedies.* | *King Leir.* |
|---|---|
| 1 *Ruf.* Be not so bitter; we are they indeede, | |
| That would deprive our fathers of their lives, | |
| So we were sure to have a benefit: | |
| I way no more the murthring of a child, | *Mes.* I haue a hart compact of Adamant |
| Drag'd from the sucking bosome of his mother, | Which neuer knew what melting pitty meant. |
| Then I respect to quaffe a boule of wine, | I weigh no more the murdring of a man, |
| Unto his health, that dearely loveth me. | Then I respect the cracking of a Flea, |
| 2 *Ruff.*...Ide hang my brother for to wear his coate, | When I doe catch her byting on my skin. |
| That all that saw me might have cause to say, | If you will haue your husband or your father, |
| There is a hart more firme than Adamant, | Or both of them sent to another world, |
| To practise execrable butcheries. | Do but commaund me doo't, it shall be done[4]. |
| *Fall.*...There is a thicket ten miles from this place, | *Rag.* To morrow morning ere the breake of day, |
| Whose secret ambush and unused wayes | I by a wyle will send them to the thicket, |
| Doth seeme to ioyne with our conspiracie: | That is about some two myles from the Court... |
| There murther him.... | This is ynough, I know, they will not fayle, |
| 1 *Ruff.* Swones her's rewards would make one kill himselfe, | And then be ready for to play thy part[5]. |
| To leave his progenie so rich a prize! | |

[1] Evidence for this conclusion is largely internal and cannot be reproduced here. Some external evidence I presented in a short article, 'On the Date of King Lear,' *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America*, Vol. xxi, pp. 462—477, June, 1906.

[2] In *Modern Language Notes*, xxiii, pp. 94 f., March, 1908.

[3] *Two Lamentable Tragedies*, Bullen, *op. cit.*, iv, p. 36; *King Leir*, ed. Greg, *Malone Society Reprints*, 1907, l. 866.

[4] ll. 1212—1219. [5] ll. 1332—4, 1338 f.

Were twentie lives engadged for this coine,
Ide end them all, to have the money mine.

2 *Ruff*....Two hundred markes to give a paltrie stab!

.....

*Fall.* Why man, he hath no father left alive....
2 *Ruff.* Why, then his little sonne is much to blame
That doth not keepe his father company.

When shall we have deliverie of the boy?
*Fall.* To morrow morning by the breake of day[4].

*Duke.* Stand close awhile, and over-heare his wordes;
He seemes much over-gone with passion[6].

*Fall.* Never the like impietie was done
A mother slaine, with terror of the sonne[8]!

*Mes.* I could teare ten in pieces with my teeth,
So in my mouth yould put a purse of gold[1].

*Mes.* I, this is it will make me do the deed:
Oh, had I euery day such customers,
This were the gainefulst trade in Christendome!
A purse of gold giu'n for a paltry stabbe[2]!

*Mes.* Why, he must go along with you to heaven:
It were not good you should go all alone.
*Leir.* No doubt, he shal, when by the course of nature,
He must surrender up his due to death:
But that time shall not come, till God permit.
*Mes.* Nay, presently, to beare you company.
I haue a Pasport for him in my pocket,
Already seald, and he must needs ride Poste.
*Shew a bagge of money*[3].

*Mes.* But in what maner must it be effected?
*Rag.* To morrow morning ere the breake of day,
I by a wyle will send them to the thicket[5].

Nay, prithy do not, they do seeme to be
Men much o'regone with griefe and misery.
Let's stand aside, and harken what they say[7].

*King.* Nor neuer like impiety was done,
Since the creation of the world begun[9].

While significance may not attach to some of the parallels cited, if they are taken alone, yet at least a half-dozen lines of the Yarington play so closely resemble the wording of the *Leir* that the agreement cannot be set down to chance. It has been noted that the one identical line appears in the Merry tragedy, but that all the other lines come from the Orphan plot, and most of them from a scene which ends on the same printed page as the identical line just noted. The bearing of this fact on the theory of separate authorship for the two plots is

[1] ll. 1329 f.
[2] ll. 1223—6.
[3] ll. 1675—82.
[4] Bullen, pp. 34 f.
[5] ll. 1331—3.
[6] p. 53.
[7] ll. 2109—2111.
[8] p. 74.
[9] ll. 2281 f.

obvious[1]. In some cases the similarity shows in thought, but more frequently it is in the language used, the expression of a commonplace idea. The phrasing of the older play seems to have been retained in memory, and to have been reproduced in the later drama more or less unconsciously.

Are we, then, to believe that the two plays had a common author? I think a careful study of them both by any student will at once produce a negative answer to the query. The *Leir* as a whole, and in the scenes just quoted, is so far superior to the Yarington play in plotting, in characterization, and in sense of form that it cannot possibly be accounted an earlier work of the same dramatist. Moreover there is evidence of more borrowing on Yarington's part from at least one other contemporary drama. Fallerio, in the Orphan plot, addresses his father, a conscienceless villain but not a hunchback, as

> Thou raw-bonde lumpe of foule deformitie[2].

Compare Anne's speech to Gloucester, *Richard III*, I, ii, 57:

> Blush, blush, thou lump of foul deformity.

The originator here will scarcely be doubted, but it is worthy of remark that *Richard III* like *King Leir* was probably on the stage in 1594[3].

In my opinion, then, we have in the *Two Lamentable Tragedies* a play written towards the end of 1594, soon after the execution of Thomas and Rachel Merry. Its author, who calls himself Rob. Yarington, I take to have been some obscure hanger-on at the theatres, perhaps an actor, or even a ballad-writer, if we may judge from the style of his verse. The *Two Tragedies* may have been his first and last attempt at playwriting. Perhaps this play later fell into the hands of Henslowe, who set Day, Haughton, and Chettle at work to make out of it two tragedies no longer extant. But if there is objection to this last theory, I am not ready to defend it.

[1] But if Yarington wrote the entire play, why did he borrow so much more from the *Leir* in the Orphan tragedy than in the other part? Perhaps the answer may be found in the perfect literalism of the Merry plot, providing situations far different from the romantic *Leir*. The lines imitated from the *Leir* come chiefly from four scenes—three in which Gonorill or Ragan plots with the Messenger to slay their father and Perillus, and one in which the attempted murder fails. The latter scene resembles in many details the one in the Yarington play where the orphan Pertillo is killed. Practically all lines cited above from the Orphan plot have to do with Pertillo's death.

[2] Bullen, p. 57.

[3] So probably was Greene's *James IV*, which was licensed for printing in 1594. Now the matter is scarcely worth mention in the text, but I think it more natural that Greene should have Sir Bartram, a Scot, declare, 'By sweet S. Andrew and may sale I sweare' (Manly, *Pre-Shaksperian Drama*, II, p. 347) than that Fallerio, an Italian, in Yarington's play should swear, 'By sweete S. Andrew and my fathers soule.' (Bullen, p. 71.)

If both parts were composed, as I believe they were, in 1594, the unconventional stage directions belong to a date seven years earlier than that usually assigned to the play. At the same time the Orphan plot must be taken as antedating the ballad of *The Children in the Wood,* which was licensed in 1595[1]. With one orphan victim and the scene laid near Padua, the play probably preserves the older version of the story. The anonymous composer of the ballad, possessed of a finer poetic sense than Yarington dreamed of, shifted the events to Norfolk in order to bring their pathos home to his English readers.

ROBERT ADGER LAW.

AUSTIN, TEXAS, U.S.A.

[1] This question as to priority of composition has been mooted ever since the days of Percy, who observes (*Reliques,* III, p. 171), 'Whoever compares the play with the ballad will have no doubt that the former is the original: the language is far more obsolete, and such a vein of simplicity runs through the whole that had the ballad been written first, there is no doubt but every circumstance of it would have been received into the drama.' Ritson supposed that he completely refuted this statement in pointing out that the ballad was entered in 1595, while the play was not published till 1601. But if Yarington wrote his work in 1594, Percy's opinion is correct. See also Furness, *Variorum Shakespeare, Richard III,* pp. 611—617; Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama,* I, pp. 346 f.

# EINE MITTELNIEDERLÄNDISCHE MYSTIKER-HANDSCHRIFT.

Vor einiger Zeit zeigte mir der Londoner Antiquar J. Tregaskis eine zierliche nl. Handschrift und erlaubte mir breitwilligst eine Beschreibung davon zu nehmen. Seither ist, wie ich erfahre, die Handschrift nach Holland verkauft worden. Da sie m.W. bisher keine nähere Beachtung erfahren hat, ihr Inhalt jedoch für das Kapitel: mystische Theologie interessant ist, so mag die Veröffentlichung meiner damals genommenen kurzen Notizen hier am Platze sein.

Der unsignierte Codex vereinigt unter einem modernen roten Sammeteinband drei durch Beschneiden der Ränder auf denselben Umfang d.i. 13·6 cm. × 9·9 cm. gebrachte Handschriften, deren jede durchaus von je einer Hand wohl um die Mitte des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts geschrieben ist. Ich behandle also die Teile I—III getrennt:

I. Eine Pergamentlage von 16 Blättern + einer Vordercustode. Als Schmuck zeigt sich auf dem ersten Blatt eine blaurote Initiale mit farbiger Verzierung und Randwerk; ausserdem blaue und rote Kapitale und rote Überschriften. Die Schrift steht auf und zwischen Linien.

Inhalt: DIE SIEBEN BUSSPSALMEN in der Übertragung Gheert Grootes, vgl. Moll in *Verhandelg. d. Acad. d. Wetenschap., Afd. Letterkde.*, XIII (1880), S. 53 ff.

*Hier beghinnē die seuen psalmen* (rot).

*Here in dijnre verbolghenheit enstraffe mi niet noch in dinen toerne en beruspe mi niet —*

Es folgt *Die Letanie* (rot), vgl. Moll, a. a. O., S. 9 ff. und *Die Collect* (rot).

Schluss: *Gode segghe wi danc. Alle ghelouighe sielen moeten rusten in vrede. Amen.*

II. Eine Papierhs., und zwar eine Lage zu 12 Bll. und sieben Lagen zu je 8 Bll. Als Schmuck finden sich rote, kunstlose Initialen, rotdurchstrichene grosse Buchstaben, rote Absatzzeichen ¶ und schliess-

lich eine rote Subscriptio: *Och leert steruen.* Dass dieser Teil des Codex wenigstens — wahrscheinlich aber der ganze — von weiblicher Hand angefertigt ward, ergibt sich aus den unten gedruckten Schreiberversen: *Voer den scriffter nv wilt oec bidden | dat si mach comen totter cribben* etc. Des Inhalts wegen könnte man an Entstehung in einem der Häuser der Schwestern vom gemeinen Leben oder an eines der Frauenklöster der Windesheimer Kongregation denken. Für den Gebrauch in den Frauenhäusern waren ja auch die in 1 angeführten Übersetzungen Grootes in erster Linie bestimmt.

Inhalt:

Ein mnl. Tractat in Briefform (*Die Epistole dē novicien eñ den ionghen gheestelike ꝑsone te leren*); er wird von dem Verfasser der ihm folgenden und durch ihn veranlassten Reimerei GHEERT GROOTE zugeschrieben; unter den bekannten Schriften des Meisters steht er, soviel ich sehen kann, nicht.

Anfang: *Hier beghint dat*[1] *prologus in der epistolen dē nouicien eñ den ionghen gheestelike ꝑsonē te leren.*

*IN xp̄o ihesu, alre liefste, du hebste my langhe tijt ghebeden eñ mit ghestadigh' anhanghen van mi begheert di wat te scriuen te leringhe tot salicheit dijnre zielen* — (Rückseite des 1. Bl.) *datti dit behaghet ond' correctie eñ v'beteringhe eens anders van betere leringhe.*

Anfang der Epistel: ¶ *Hoe hem een te rechte bereydē sal te gaen in der oerdē. Teerst capittel.*

*Alre liefste, wantu in eenre heiligher oerden gaen wilste aennemende een heilige beghinsel eens waerachtich gheestelix leuens eñ mitten viant alre dogheden*[2] *eñ alle goeder werkē te stride gaen, so ist ti eerst noet eñ oerbarlic, alle wleyschelike mīne, begheerte eñ toeneighen van dijnre harten te doen* etc.

Die Epistel zerfällt in 38 Kapitel, deren letztes die Überschrift hat: *Hoe men niet arbeiden en sel om diensten of hoeghen staet te vercrighen, eñ hoemen scuwen sel vermetenh*[t] *eñ groet willen te schinen.*

Den Schluss bildet folgendes Nachwort:

*Dit hebbe ic di ghescreuen om dijnre anhanghender begheerte eñ om dijnre mīnen willen eñ hebt mit groten arbeit vollbrocht als onse lieue h'e verleende, eñ hebbe sommighe dinghen om d' cortheit over gheslaghen. Daer om rade ic di dattu dicwyl leeste eñ weder leeste dat spieghel d' moniken, dat spieghel sinte bernaerts*[3]*, die epistel totten broederē in den*

[1] Über der Zeile ergänzt. [2] Davor *doech* durchstrichen.

[3] Eine mnl. Übersetzung s. in *Tijdschr. v. Ned. Taal- en Letterk.*, Deel XIV, 20—25. Ist sie Gheert Groote zuzuschreiben?

*berghe gods, profectus eñ sinte Iheronimus steruen. In welken ic hoepe, dattu vele dinghen selste vindē, di di noet syn tot salicheit dijnre zielen. Nu alre liefste, ic hebbe mi seluen onwijs eñ dwaes ghemaect om dine salicheit eñ hebbe my meester ghemaect, eer ic discipel te rechte gheworden bin. Eñ hebbe mi onder wonden and'en menschē te leren · het hadde mi saligher gheweest, dat ic mi seluen gheleert hadde, want ic heb di gheleert te houden dat ic selue leyder niet en doe, ende hebbe di gheleert somighe dinghe te laten, di ic selue alle daghe doe. Nochtan ic nv apset eñ wil mi mitti beteren eñ werden oec discipel in mijns selfs leringhe..... Ic beuele mi dijnre ghestadigher ghebeden · eñ als ic doot bin, so wil mi niet vergheten in dijnre memorien in der missen. Onse lieue heer moet di bewaren eñ di volstandicheit gheuen tot enen salighen eynde toe, want so wie volstandich is tot in den eynden toe, die sel behouden bliuden. Dis gunne di eñ ons allen mitti die vader, die soen eñ die heilighe gheest. AMEN.*

Darauf folgt, ohne durch eine besondere Initiale hervorgehoben zu sein, die oben angezogene Reimerei in abgesetzten Zeilen, so zwar, dass der erste Buchstabe der ungeraden Zeilen gross geschrieben und rot gestrichelt ist. Sie verrät freilich mehr guten Willen und Andacht als dichterische Begabung:

*Een scoen epistel is hier ghescreuen,*
*na welken ons god nv gheef te leuen,*
*Welc epistel oec heeft ghemaect*
*meester ghert die groet van staet,*
*Allen nuwen voertgaende lude*
*scriuende, lerende, roepende lude*
*Dat leuen xpi mit herten te volghen,*
*op dat hi niet en werde werbolghen,*
*Als hi ten oerdel sel comen rechten*
*eñ alle dinghen warachtelic slechten,*
*Den sondighen menschen dat ewighe vier*
*te gheuen als sie verdienen hier,*
*Den lāmeren staende te rechter hant*
*tonfanghen so guetelic in sijnre hant.*
*Och! of ic nv so machte leuen,*
*als in der epistelen staet ghescreuen*
*Eñ si ons leert tot alre stont:*
*te reynighen dat herte al inder gront,*

14. *tonfanghen*, das übergeschriebene *t* von jüngerer Hand.

*Vrolic eñ blide soud ic wesen*
*eñ alle mijnen druc seer wel ghenesen,*
*Want voer den oerdel so soud ic staen*
*sonder enighe sonde bevaen.*
*Wat isser oec blider nv in der tijt*
*der consciencien ghene strijt*
*Inder herten nv te draghen,*
*daer luttel menschen nv om vraghen,*
*Eñ inder aerden also te leuen*
*also ment wilt nemen eñ gheuen?*
*Och! of si alle nv wouden merken*
*haer leuen, haer woerden eñ werken*
*Die te regieren eñ te schicken*
*in alle manieren eñ sticken*
*Als dese epistel ons allen nv leert,*
*si souden gheringhe al worden bekeert*
*Tot compunctien eñ tot suchten*
*van haren sonden daer si voer duchten;*
*Mer si en vorde'n niet als te veel,*
*al lesen die scriften si al gheheel.*
*Wat mach die zaec al hier of wesen*
*so luttel te vorderen, als sise lesen?*
*Die sake daer of die moghē wi ramē,*
*als ons die scriften daer of vernamen,*
*Die sake daer of, also ic meen,*
*die macher of wesen oec nv aleen*
*Dat wys niet zeer tot herten en trecken*
*eñ onse ziel so seer beulecken,*
*Oec onse herten so sijn versteent,*
*wat die scrifte daer mede meent,*
*Niet ouer en legghen in onse ghemoede,*
*so datse mocht comen tot allen goede;*
*Mer die scriuer en heuet te min,*
*al ist dat wi daer ghene sin*
*Noch ru en hebben noch cōnen verstaen*
*ghelyc een blint mensch in der maen.*
*Hier om wāneer wi scriften lesen,*
*laet ons altoes mit herten vresen*

23. *in der*, davor *inder* ausgestrichen. 41. *daer*, davor *die* ausgestrichen.
42. *vernamen*] *vermen.* 45. *tot* aus *te* korrigiert. 51. l. *die scriftuer*?
54. *maen*] *n* aus *r* korrigiert.

*Eñ eder cauwen in onser zielen,*
*en willen wijs anders niet vernielē.*
*Want wat wi lesen of wat wi scriuē,*
*wi moetent in onser herten wriuen*
*Een gheestelic broot daer of te makē,*
*dat onse zielen wel mach smaken;*
*Mit welken brode wi worden gheuoet*
*eñ so sterc in onse ghemoet*
*Teghens den viant tot allen tiden*
*manlic te vechten eñ te striden,*
*Oec mede te wanderen totten throen,*
*daer die enghelen singhen so scoen.*
*Laet ons nv bidden mit naersticheit*
*gode van den hemel mit ynnicheit,*
*Marien onser lieuer vrouwen,*
*dattet ons allen moet ghewouden*
*Mit allen heilighen daer toe mede,*
*dat wi nv moeten hebben vreden*
*Eñ twoert gods so moeten ontfanghen,*
*dat wi altoes daer na verlanghen*
*Mit herte, mit ziele dat te pleghen,*
*om te vorderen in onsen leuen*
*Tot volmaectheit der heiliger doghedē*
*eñ te leuen mit alre vrogheden.*
*Die coninc der glorien die moet ons gheuē*
*een salich einde na desen leuen. Amen.*

Der Rest des Blattes (2 Zeilen) ist leer, auf dem nächsten folgen acht Schreiberverse, die ihrem Tone nach wohl auch vom Verfasser des Gedichtes herrühren werden. Sie lauten:

*Voer den scriffter nv wilt oec bidden,*
*dat si mach comen totter cribben*
*Ihesu $\overline{xpi}$ des menschen soen,*
*mit hem to hebben dat grote loen,*
*Dat hi belouet sinen vriendē*
*in der aerden, die hem dienen:*
*Sijn loen moet sijn dat ewighe leuen,*
*dat ihesus $\overline{xps}$ ons allen moet gheuē.*
*Amen.*

57. zieler.

Darunter der häufige Vers:

*Een cort iolijt in deser tyt v'corē*
*dats zekerlijc voer hemelrijc te veel v'lorē.*

Nach dem *si* in v. 2 zu urteilen handelte es sich also um eine geistliche Frau als Verfasserin der Reimerei und obiger Schlussverse; allein das *den scrifter* (st. *de scrijverse*) in v. 1 und das an und für sich zwar nicht unmögliche *sijn* (st. *haer*) in v. 7 weisen doch zu deutlich auf einen Mann als Schreiber und Reimer der Vorlage, dessen Arbeit jene nur eben kopierte und dabei **hi* in *si* änderte. Auf welche Autorität sich der Schreiber der Vorlage stützte, als er den Traktat, der seine gutgemeinten Verse auslöste, Gheert Groote zuschrieb, können wir nicht wissen. Seine Vorlage mag den Namen enthalten haben, er kann ihm aber auch durch Hörensagen vermittelt worden sein.

Zwei Prosagebete zu *Christus* und je ein Spruch des hl. *Gregorius* und *Augustinus* bringen diesen Teil des Codex zum Abschluss.

III. Pergament; fünf Lagen zu je 8 Bll., doch fehlt der vierten Bl. 2 und 3. Blaue, rotausgezierte Initialen eröffnen jedes selbständige Stück; sonst finden sich einfach rote und blaue Kapitale, rot durchstrichene grosse Buchstaben, rot unterstrichene Wörter, rote Überschriften und rote Absatzzeichen. Die Schrift steht auf und zwischen mit Rötel gezogenen Linien.

Folgendes ist der Inhalt:

1. *Eene guede dagelixe oefeninge in die weke* (rot).

*Alle die werelt is in enē quaden geset dat is in een vuyr der begeerlicheit deser nedersten dingen..... Hier om ist noot dat die mensche elle dage enē voirworp der oefeninge voirneme dair sün harte mede geuangen werde dattet bi gode in eenvoudicheden bliuen moge. Des Sonnendages* (rot). *Ten eersten is: des sonnēdages seltu dencken an dinē scepper* etc. Betrachtungen für jeden Tag bis *des sat'dages.*

2. *Dit is van guet exempel te geuē* (rot).

*Sinte pouwels scriuet aldus tot dien van corinthen. Wir voirsien guede dingen niet allene voir gode mar oic voir die lude. — Die lieue heer geue ons allen gereichte kennisse ende mynne ende bidde voir mi blinde ende coude mensche.*

*Hier endet van hoe anxtelic dattet is and' lude quaet exempel te geuē off te scandalisierē.*

3. Ohne Titel: *Die heilige leraer sinte pouwels spreect dat dat rike goods dat bynnē ons is dat is gerechtiz; vrede ende bliscap in den heiligen gheest. wie wil mit gode vmmermeer regnieren off tot gode comen off dat god in hē woene, die moet dese drie in hem voelen of dair na pinen, dat hi se crige na sünre macht.* Der Traktat füllt 5 Bll. und scheint abzubrechen mit: *Och armen, hoe wort menich mensch ontstecken int harte, in tonge, in lyue mit gruwelikē helschē zweren ende scelden om een cleyn woirt redelic off onredelic dat sȳ naeste sprecket.* Die Rückseite dieses Blattes und die Vorderseite des nächsten sind leer, darauf folgt als letztes Stück:

4. Eine Predigt *H. Seuses* auf Cant. Cantic. 1, 15:

*Lectulus nost' floridus. Dese woirde staen gescreuen ind' mynnen boke — ēn dat si sonder alle middel vā gode in dat ewige leuen ontfangen wair. Daer brenge ons die mynre der reynicheit, die geuer der salicheit, die troester ind' gelatenheit ihesus cristus. Amen.*

Vgl. Bihlmeyer, Heinrich Seuse, *Deutsche Schriften*, Stuttgart, 1907, S. 505—8; über die Verbreitung der Predigt im Niederländischen, wofür unsere Hs. ein neues Zeugnis ist, W. Dolch, *Die Verbreitung oberländischer Mystikerwerke im Niederländischen*, Leipziger Dissertation, 1909, I. S. 80.

R. Priebsch.

London.

# THE 'TRACTATUS ORTHOGRAPHIAE' OF T. H., PARISII STUDENTIS.

Two of the extant treatises on French Orthography compiled in the Middle Ages for the benefit of the inhabitants 'in partibus cismarinis' have been already published: the *Orthographia Gallica*[1] and its commentaries, and the *Tractatus Orthographiae*[2] of Coyfurelly, Doctor in law of Orleans, a remaniement, as the compiler himself tells us, of the work of a certain 'T. H., student of Paris.'

The short treatise published below is contained in the manuscript Addit. 17716, f. 88—91, of the British Museum. It did not escape the notice of the editor of the *Orthographia Gallica*, but the terms in which he mentions it in his preface are so misleading that its importance has been consistently overlooked. 'Coyfurelly's Traktat,' he remarks[3], 'steht in einem 2. MS....Der Text weicht öfter vom Oxforder MS. ab.'

The view of the relationship between the two treatises implied in these words is, we venture to think, entirely erroneous. The short treatise contained in the MS. of the British Museum is not merely another version of the *Tractatus Orthographiae* of Coyfurelly; it is the original on which his treatise is based, i.e., the work of T. H., the Parisian student, and may even, we believe, dispute the claim of the *Orthographia Gallica* to be considered the earliest extant orthographical treatise on the French language.

The detailed comparison of the two treatises leaves no doubt as to the relationship that exists between them.

[1] *Orthographia Gallica, Ältester Traktat über französische Aussprache und Orthographie*, published by Stürzinger in the *Altfranzösische Bibliothek*, vol. III.

[2] Published by Stengel in the *Zeitschrift für neufranzösische Sprache und Literatur*, vol. I, pp. 16—22.

[3] Introduction, p. iii.

(1) The British Museum treatise is no mere abridgement of Coyfurelly's work, for though considerably shorter it yet contains precepts omitted in his *Tractatus*. These are as follows:

(*a*) Under § 2 (*b*) the remark on *v* in *avray*.

(*b*) § 10 the use of *m* in the termination of the 1st pers. pl. and the pronunciation of *m* + consonant.

(*c*) § 12 the use of *k* for *qu*.

(*d*) § 18 (*b*) the remark on *doulz*.

(*e*) § 19 (*a*) the remark on the suppression of *c* in *soloncque*.

(*f*) § 25 the difference between *si* and *se*.

(*g*) § 26 the remark on the conformity to Latin orthography.

We may note also that Coyfurelly has nothing to correspond to sections 5 and 16, which repeat in substance rules given elsewhere.

(2) The additions and alterations in the *Tractatus* are too thoroughgoing and above all too systematic to be explicable on any theory of scribal carelessness or error. They indicate clearly a deliberate recasting of the older treatise. We may group them under four heads:

(*a*) Additional examples to rules common to both treatises, e.g., the sections dealing with final *t* and *s* mute.

(*b*) Amplification, codification, a correction of rules contained in the British Museum treatise, e.g., the section deals with *ll*, *l* final, *s*, *t*, *x*.

(*c*) New rules or remarks, e.g., pronunciation of *e* fem. (replacing § 5), *n* of third plural (replacing § 10), *k* hard, *p* final, and on the graphy *ngn*.

(*d*) Remarks on dialectal pronunciation and orthography, mainly Picard, e.g., *ai*, *ie*, *k*, *l*, *p* + cons., *s*, *qu* and the retention of declension[1].

The aim Coyfurelly set before himself in introducing these changes was clearly twofold. He wished to supply fuller information about the Picard dialect, much in vogue at his time, and, more particularly, to bring the earlier treatise up to date.

It is notoriously difficult to date the changes in mediaeval French with any accuracy, but there is no doubt that the additions and omissions

[1] Completely misunderstood by Coyfurelly.

combined mark a very considerable advance in pronunciation and in its observation. Coyfurelly's new rules run as follows:

(1) *E* vero sonum fere tenebit sicut *a* littera et principaliter in fine diccionis cum brevi et acuto accentu pronunciandum, verbi gracia: *Je vien i endrois. Veicy belle chose*, p. 17, ll. 14—16.

(2) *N* autem posita inter vocalem et consonantem in fine alicuius diccionis, que sit verbum tercie persone pluralis numeri modi indicativi vel optativi, cuiuscumque temporis fuerit, de jure non sonabitur, verbi gratia *ils aiment, ils lisent, ils dient; ils amoient, ils lisoient, ils disoient; ils amerent, ils listrent, ils distrent, ils amassent, ils laissassent* et huiusmodi, tamen ista verba excipiuntur, sicut *vont, ont, sont, font, avoient, eurent, estoient, furent, fesoient* et *firent* cum omnibus eorum compositis, ut *envont, enont, enfont, ensont, enavoient* et huiusmodi, in quibus *n* sonum proprium totaliter reservabit. p. 18, ll. 15—23.

(3) *P* vero posita in fine diccionis, consonante immediate sequente sonum suum penitus omittere debet, verbi gracia *ne massez ja trop grand avoir*, exceptis propriis nominibus in *p* desinentibus ut *Philip*; set si vocalis immediate sequatur sonum suum plenarie reservabit, ut *mieulx vaut assez que trop avor.* Item ista nomina *dras, tens, cors sine p* sunt scribenda, prout rectus sonus exigit in hac parte. Tamen Romanici non tenent illam regulam, quia pro majori parte *p* in huiusmodi semper scribunt. Et in gallico bene potest itaque scribi, ut *draps, temps, corps.* p. 18, ll. 24—31.

(4) *G* autem posita in medio diccionis inter vocalem et consonantem habebit sonum quasi *n* et *g* ut *compaignon, compaignie, moigne* et *maigne.* Tamen Gallici pro majori parte scribunt *n* in medio, ut *compaingnon, compaingnie, moingne, maingne,* quod melius est. p. 17, ll. 17—20.

The modern character of these additions is obvious. With Coyfurelly's omissions we are on less sure ground[1], but the more important of them are evidently occasioned by some change of pronunciation or orthography. Thus §§ 10 and 12 deal with two A.N. usages that fell into desuetude at a comparatively early date: the use of *m* in the termination of the 1st person plural, a survival of the old Western termination *om* or *um,* and the graphy *k,* described as archaic in the *Orthographia Gallica*[2]. § 25, on *si* and *se,* is directed against a usage too well established in Coyfurelly's time to be combated usefully by him[3].

The general significance, then, of the changes introduced by Coyfurelly and the relationship between the two treatises is unmistakable. The *Tractatus* is a remaniement of the British Museum treatise and this latter work may without temerity be ascribed to the Parisian student T. H.

A further question is not without interest.

Coyfurelly's treatise was composed presumably in the latter part of

[1] Partly because the significance of the rule is not always clear. Cf. § 18 (*b*).

[2] § XII.

[3] *Si* is frequent in A.N. from the twelfth century on; cf. Rydberg, *Zur Geschichte des Französischen*, II, § 198.

the reign of Edward IV or under Richard II[1]. Obviously if T. H.'s work then stood in need of recasting it must have been composed some time earlier. What then is its position with regard to the *Orthographia Gallica*?

Stürzinger, it may be remembered, placed this treatise at the turn of the thirteenth century for the following reasons[2]:

(1) Absence of any mention of the orthography *aun* for *an*.
(2) The note on *k* for *qu*.
(3) The use of *gn* for *ngn*.
(4) The beginning of the use of *y*.
(5) The use of round *s*.

On no single point touched on in these rules do the precepts of T. H. mark any advance in pronunciation, and in one case already noted—the use of *k* for *qu*—the usage indicated is distinctly more archaic, T. H. allowing a graphy that the *Orthographia* considers out of date. Of T. H.'s other rules the only one that seems to be based upon more modern pronunciation is the dictum on *s* + consonant (§ 14). The *Orthographia*, it will be remembered, assimilates *st* to *ght*, i.e., indicates the slightly aspirated pronunciation that preceded the suppression of this sound, while T. H.'s rule demands complete suppression. A careful scrutiny of the example given however, and more particularly of the long list of exceptions, shows that it is the formulation of the rule in T. H. that is here at fault, or at any rate too sweeping, and that the modernity of his pronunciation of this sound is more apparent than real. The examples in support of the rule all fall under the head of *s* + sonant, i.e., they illustrate the suppression of the sound in conditions under which it had long since become mute; the exceptions consist either of borrowed words, or more largely of words in which *s* stands before *t, p, c, ch*, i.e., in the conditions mentioned in the *Orthographia*, those under which it longest retained its sibilant character. Thus T. H. in making no mention of aspiration in these words at all, attests a pronunciation if anything more archaic than that indicated by the remark in the other treatise.

Since then T. H.'s work contains no rule attesting a pronunciation more modern than that described in the *Orthographia Gallica*, and one certainly based on earlier orthographical custom, it is not unreasonable to conclude that his treatise was the first in the field, and that it is to

[1] Cf. Stengel, *loc. cit.*, p. 23. The evidence relied upon is the mention of the Duke of Lancaster's name among the examples.
[2] Introduction, pp. xxxix—xlv.

T. H., the Parisian student, that we must ascribe the honour of having compiled the first orthographical treatise on Northern French.

Fol. 88 r°. Cuiuslibet[1] creature auxilio indigentis in terris relevare ubi sperat celerius obtinere et quoniam nonnulli sunt desiderantes diversis facultatibus florescere in iuventute sicut viridiarium diversis arboribus et virtutibus herbarum nobiliter plantatum vide[n]tur multociens fructus et vapores non modicum redolentes temporibus estatum feliciter propalare. Hinc est quod auxilio trinitatis que regnat trinus in uno, licet insufficiens, sermones gallicanos et formam scripture cum regulis in eisdem intendo propulsare et secundum usum et modum modernorum tam in partibus transmarinis quam cismarinis dulciter explanare, unde herbarum rami moribus et scientia primo florescere et postea in alios poterunt insingniri, omnium Regum clemencia disponente.

§ 1. Primo sciendum est quod litterarum alie sunt vocales, alie consonantes. Vocales sunt quinque, scilicet, *a, e, i, o* et *u*; et dicuntur vocales quia per se plenam vocem habent et sine illis nulla vox litteralis proferri potest. Et ex hiis quinque vocalibus due transiunt in vim consonancium, scilicet *i* et *u*, ut quando ponuntur in principio alicuius sillabe et sillabicantur cum vocali sequente, ut *iuere, vaulter, iouster, verser* et sic de similibus.

§ 2. Et sciendum est quod *A* aliquando debet sonari fere sicut *e* litteram, verbi gracia: *Sauez vouz faire un chauncoun. Sauez vous traire del ark. Sauez vous raire la barbe,* et sic de similibus.

(*a*) Item iste dicciones: *a, en a,* et *i a* que unum et idem significant quando capiuntur pro hoc verbo *habet,* simpliciter debent scribi sine hac litera *d* subsequenter. Idcirco errant qui huiusmodi dicciones scribunt cum *d,* verbi gracia *a, en a,* (fol. 88 v°.) quia *d* secundum gallicos nunquam ibidem scribitur nec sonatur.

(*b*) Item iste dicciones: *aura, en array* sine *e* in medio [scribi debent et] sonari, secundum dulce gallicum, sine *v* ut sic: *aray, en array* que indifferenter sic scribi possunt. Tamen Romanici, Britannici et Anglii scribunt easdem dicciones cum *e* in medio ut *aueray, j'aueray* et sic de similibus.

§ 3. *B* vero in medio diccionis semper debet sonari; ut *debriser, trubuler* etc., exceptis his diccionibus *debt, endebt, subget,* necnon istis

[1] Latin abbreviations have been expanded throughout; French ones are given in the footnotes.

verbis: *doubter*[1], *redoubter*[1], *substituer* in quibus et similibus *B* in medio scribi debet set non sonari.

§ 4. *C* etiam in medio diccionis quoque habet sonum *s*, ut in hiis diccionibus *ca, pica, recoi, frauncois*[2], *rauncon*[2], *chauncoun*[2] et huiusmodi. Unde errant qui scribunt cum *s*.

§ 5. *E* vero qui desinit in diccione et diccio subsequens incipit cum *a, e,* vel *o,* ut *jeo aime, jeo eusse loie* et similia, penitus extrahitur et de illis duabus diccionibus fiet una diccio, verbi gracia *jaime, ieousse loie*. Tamen ille vocales que transiunt in vim consonancium non tenent illam regulam.

§ 6. *G* posita in medio diccionis inter vocalem et consonantem habebit sonum quasi *ng*, ut *compaignoun, compaign.*

§ 7. *H* vero non est litera set aspiracionis nota, ut in hiis diccionibus: *heitez, haiez, huis, hors, hounte, honye, hopeland, herd, harde, aherder,* in quibus *h* semper sonabitur, set in hiis diccionibus *huit, huie, hier, heyer, heur, hostiller, he, helas, honour*[3], in istis *h* non debet asspirari et sic de huiusmodi.

§ 8. *I* vero et alie vocales in medio diccionis inter duas consonantez seu inter vocalem et consonantem aut [in] fine diccionis, sonum ex utraque parte habebit, ut *biens, riens, ciens, liens, meins, eins, ioie, voie, arraier* et huiusmodi.

§ 9. *L* autem in medio diccionis, vocali inmediate sequente, sonum (fol. 89 r°.) proprium reservabit, ut *ouelement, parlant*[4]. Set si consonans inmediate sequatur, tunc *l* habebit sonum *u*, ut *loialment, principalment,* hac diccione *ils* tanto modo excepta, in qua *l* sonum *u* minime retenebit, ut *ils vount enscamble, ils ount fait. L* eciam posita in fine diccionis et sequens diccio incipiat a consonante, sonum proprium amittet et sonum *u* retinebit ut, *lamirall*[5] *dengliter, chiualt sorelt, fel de makerell mauez est, beal fitz.* Si, vero, diccio sequens incipiat a vocali tunc *l* sonum proprium retinebit, ut *nult aultre, nult amy, loial hom, tiel usage.* Tamen *l* posita in fine diccionis que est monasillaba si consonans inmediate sequatur, sonum *u* nec proprium reservabit, ut *il sen est ale, ie le voilt ben*[6] et sic de similibus.

§ 10. *N* vero in quolibet verbo in prima persona pluralis scribatur loco *m* et habebit sonum *m*, ut *aymons, enseignons, lisons,* et similia. Item

[1] abbreviated *doubt̄., redoubt̄.* [2] *frauncois, rauncon, chauncon.*
[3] *honō.* [4] *plant.* [5] *larālt.* [6] *bn.*

*m* ante consonantem quoque debet sonari ut *ensi, penser, sentiere, envoiere, entiere, coumaunder*[1], *vendersdy* et huiusmodi.

§ 11. *P* vero inter duas consonantes posita non habebit sonum in diccionibus monosyllabis[2], ut *temps, corps* et huiusmodi. Tamen licet *p* in illis diccionibus et aliis consimilibus amittatur, non est vicium ut *tens, cors* escritur, *semagn* et huiusmodi.

§ 12. *Q* vero secundum ortografiam gallicam nunquam debet scribi in aliqua diccione sine duabus vocalibus immediate sequentibus, ut *qui, que, quar*, et huiusmodi indifferenter possunt scribi cum *k*.

Item hec diccio *quar* indifferenter potest scribi cum *k*, *q*, vel *c* ad voluntatem scriptoris.

§ 13. *R* vero aliquando in fine diccionis retinebit sonum *r* et aliquando sonum *z*, ut *vuilez vouz aler* ou *voilez vous alez* et sic de similibus.

§ 14. *S* vero simplex in medio diccionis non debet sonari si consonans inmediate sequatur, ut *tres redoubte, tres noble, sisme, disme* et huiusmodi. Ab ac regula excipiantur iste dicciones: *prosperite*[3], *chastelt, chestaine, substance, meschaunt, obstant, augustus, instance*[4], (89 v°.) *register, sustenance, espirer, sustener*[5], *substituer, escharn, trangliter, enspirer, descharger, estauncher*[6], *estendre, espaundre, peschere, constrayner*[7], *despenser*[8], *escuter*, cum omnibus eorum partium nominibus, et adverbiis ac verbis ab eisdem qualitercumque egredientibus in quibus *s* semper debet sonari licet consonans inmediate sequatur. Si vero vocal*is* inmediate sequatur tunc sonum proprium reservabit plenarie, ut *tres excellent*[9], *tres hautisme, tres honoure et tres humble. Ss* vero duplex in medio diccionis posita semper pronunciari debet ut *poissoun*[10], *puissaunt*[11] et huiusmodi. Si vero *s* simplex in fine diccionis ponatur, que sit pronomen, verbum, conjuncio vel proposicio et sequens diccio incipiat a consonante, sonum suum minime reservabit, ut *dieu vouz save et guarde, vouz sentez vous*[12] *sainz en coer, voillez vouz manger, vuillez vouz juer* et simil*ia*. Set si sequens diccio incipiat a vocale tunc *s* debet sonari, ut *auez vouz fait, vouz em pri*[13], *seiez vouz, ia estez vouz un de eaux* et sic de similibus.

Tamen in participiis, adjectis, nominibus et interjecionibus *s* simplex in fine diccionis debet retinere sonum suum licet consonans immediate sequatur, ut *vouz auez assez de viand, jeo sui assez ben*[14] *amez de mez servauntz*[15], *loiez soit dieux* et sic de similibus.

[1] *cōmaunder.* [2] *monessilbīs.* [3] *ꝑspite.* [4] *īstāc.*
[5] *susten*s. [6] *estuucher.* [7] *constyner.* [8] *despenꝰ.*
[9] *excelt.* [10] *poissoūn.* [11] *puissuut.* [12] *vog.*
[13] *pr̃.* [14] *bn.* [15] *s̄uutz.*

§ 15. *T* vero si in fine diccionis ponatur et diccio sequens incipiat a consonante tunc debet sonum suum penitus amittere, ut *qu'est ceo qu'il dist, il est prest, il ne poet chaloyre, il fuist tout esbaye, il fist que sage, il nia que vanite en cest mound*[1] et sic de similibus. Aliquando tamen *t* habebit sonum suum in fine diccionis nonobstante illa regula: *as tu fait prest nostre*[2] *sopere, il prent deux marcz par*[3] *an, nos vesins nous ayment ben*[4]*, il boit trope hault, il puit malement,* in hiis et similibus *t* retinebit sonum (fol. 90 r°) licet consonans immediate sequatur in proxima diccione sequente.

(*a*) Item omnia nomina et participia terminancia in *t* in singulari amittent *t* in plurali et scribantur ac sonabuntur cum *s* vel *z* ut *saint, faisaunt, alant,* in singulari et in plurali *sains, faisauns*[5]*, alans* et sic de similibus. *T* vero in medio semper habet plenam vocem et si fuerit feminini generis vo*cales* immediate sequuntur, ut *lez saintez virges du ciel, ad toutz et quauntez*[6] *foitz vouz plerra venir, vous serrez bien*[7] *venuy, beaucop dez femmez en Loundrez sount merchauntz*[8] et sic de similibus.

(*b*) Item secundum gallicum *t* omittatur in istis diccionibus, *liz, pounz, porpoinz*[9], et sic cetera cum *z* vel *s*. Tamen Vasconici et Anglici scribunt cum *t, ut amy sount noz litz faitz, sount noz porpointz*[9] *prestez* quod non est gallicum immo Vasconicum.

(*c*) Item *t* in ista conjuncione *et* gallice prolata non sonabitur licet scribatur.

§ 16. *L* vero in istis diccionibus *doulz, ceulz, meulz, peaulz* indifferenter possunt scribi cum *l* vel sine *l* et quando *l* ponitur in fine diccionis et consonans subsequitur, tunc *l* habebit sonum *u* ut *veaul,* set *gentil de corps* et sic de similibus.

§ 17. *U* vero quando ponatur in medio diccionis sonum proprium amittet ut *que*[10]*, qui, quar, guerri langue, quel, quatre, guerre* et huiusmodi.

§ 18. *X* vero in fine diccionis indifferenter potest sonari quasi *s* vel *z*: *no chiualx, chiuelx, huiselx, ceulx, telx, doulx, et meulx* que quidem dicciones indifferenter possunt scribi cum *x, s,* vel *z* et sic de similibus.

(*a*) Item hec diccio *dieux* aliquando scribitur cum *x* et aliquando non et licet scribatur non sonabitur, ut *dieux vouz save, dieux soit garde de vouz,* tamen quando ponitur in vocativo tunc *x* retinebit sonum, ut *dieux, eiey pite de moy* et si consonans sequatur tunc non sonabitur ut *dieux mercye* et sic de similibus.

[1] *mound.* [2] *nre.* [3] *p.* [4] *bn.* [5] *faisauns.*
[6] *quutez.* [7] *bñ.* [8] *mchuutz.* [9] *p̃poinz, p̃pointz.* [10] *q̃.*

(*b*) Item hec diccio *doulz* in masculino genere et neutro debet scribi (fol. 90 v°.) cum *x* in fine et cum fuerit feminini generis cum *c*.

§ 19. Ista diccio *ouec* diversis modis potest scribi ut *oueque, oueques*[1] sine *s* in medio.

(*a*) Item hec diccio *solonque*[2] in *n* vel in *c* indifferenter potest terminare ut *solon,* vel *soloncque* cum *c*. ibidem non debet sonari.

(*b*) Iste dicciones *escue, esau* (?) *escuiele cuiler* et huiusmodi debent scribi cum *c* et non cum *q*.

§ 20. *Y* vero habet sonum *i* in omni loco et debet scribi in pluralibus locis loco *i*, causa ornatae scripturae et principaliter in propriis nominibus civitatum et villarum, cognominibus virorum mulierum et dignitatum.

§ 21. *Z* vero in fine diccionis quasi *s* sonabitur in effectu, ut *querez, serchez, aimez* et sic de similibus.

§ 22. Et sciendum est prout in parte dixi per antea de vocalibus quod quociens aliqua diccio monesillebica desinit in vocali et sequens diccio incipiat a vocali, tunc ille due dicciones debent ad invicem conjungi quasi sub una diccione pronunciando et prima vocalis nec debet scribi nec sonari ut *la abbe u l'abbe, l'on u la on, masdre d'argent, j'aime* et sic de similibus.

§ 23. Item omnia verba cuiuscumque fuerint conjugacionis terminancia in *s* indifferenter possunt scribi cum *s* vel *z* ad libitum scriptoris, ut *amez, veniez, ditez, lisez, pensez,* ac omnia participia terminancia in *e*, cuiusque generis fuerint, debent scribi cum *ee* dupliciter in fine ad differenciam suorum verborum a quibus descendunt ut *amee* participiam ad differentiam huius verbi *ame, enseignee* ad differentiam huius verbi *enseigne*[3] et sic de similibus.

§ 24. Item nomina terminancia in *c, ff* vel *g* numero singulari ut *blanc, viff, long* in plurali vero debent scribi secundum gallicos cum *s* in fine diccionis, expellendo penitus *c, ff* et *g* ut *blans, vis*, et *lons.*

§ 25. Item habetur differentia inter has dicciones *si* et *se* id est *si* gallice, *sic* latine et *se* gallice id est *si* latine.

§ 26. Item quelibet diccio gallica concordans latino in quantum poterit debet sequi scripturam latini.

§ 27. Item omnia nomina cuiuscumque generis fuerint in fine diccionis habencia sonum duplicis *ee* cum duplici *ee* scribi debent, ut *pensee, privee, finee, rousee, vinee,* et huiusmodi prout participia superius terminant et proportant.

MILDRED K. POPE.

OXFORD.

[1] *oueq, ouegs.* [2] *solonq.* [3] *enseign̄.*

# MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

## The Chaucerian 'Merciles Beaute.'

I think we must all be much obliged to Professor Lowes for his useful and convincing article on this subject. May I be allowed to point out an emendation, by which I think the sense and rhythm of the poem may be improved?

We have only one late MS. copy; evidently a bad copy of an excellent original.

Line 26 runs thus in the MS.:

I neuere thenk to ben in his prison lene.

Perhaps we should omit the word 'to,' and simply read 'thenke ben.' However, this does not affect the sense. It is much more material to observe that we ought to omit 'in.' This is why, in my modernised edition of Chaucer's *Prologue* and *Minor Poems*, published by Chatto and Windus in 1907, I give the line as follows:

I think to be no more his prisoner lean.

It was Chaucer who would have been lean if he had continued longer in Love's prison. As it was, he escaped while still fat.

It is clear that 'in' is not required by the metre. I think it was an interpolation, due to the fact that the scribe was not familiar with the use of the word 'prisoun' in the sense of 'prisoner.' Chaucer, as my Glossarial Index shows, in other places used the form *prisonere*; but the two forms are both used in this sense in *Piers Plowman*: 'prisoneres,' B. iii. 136, xiv. 168, 'prisoun,' 'prisones,' B. vii. 30, xviii. 58 etc., and in Gower's *Mirour*, 5696, 9840.

In such a case, the scribe might easily have taken 'prisoun' to have had its more usual sense, and would then think it necessary to insert 'in.' This is why I think we ought to read:

I neuere thenke ben his prisoun lene.

Walter W. Skeat.

Cambridge.

## The Name of the Author of 'Piers Plowman.'

Some argument has been expended upon the question whether the surname of the author of *Piers Plowman* was Langland or Langley. Pearson's argument in favour of the latter alternative is interesting and ingenious, and the close proximity to one another of the hamlets of Langley and Ruckley (Rokeley) at no great distance from Cleobury Mortimer, taken in connexion with the traditional statement that the name of the poet's father was Stacy de Rokayle and that he himself was born at Cleobury Mortimer, makes the conclusion tempting. Nevertheless it is not to be accepted, because it is contrary to the tradition. The surname is always given as Langland, never as Langley.

But with regard to Christian name there is no such agreement. The text of the poem gives us William (or 'Wille') as the name of the dreamer, and the MSS. call the poem 'Visio Willelmi,' but this is by no means conclusive as regards the name of the author, who may very well have been speaking in a fictitious character, or at all events under a fictitious name. Tradition on the whole is in favour of 'Robert' rather than 'William' as the actual name of the author. The note in MS. Dublin D. 4. 1 gives his name as 'Willelmus de Langlond,' but in one of the Ashburnham MSS. we are told that 'Robert or William Langland made Pers Ploughman.' Bale calls him simply Robertus Langelande, apparently on the excellent authority of Nicholas Brigham ('ex collectis Nicolai Brigam'), and Bale is followed by Crowley, the printer of the first edition. Now if the real name was Robert, it is easy to see why some should have supposed that it was William: the tendency to identify the dreamer of the poem with the author, both in character and in name, would be very natural. But if William was the real name, whence did the suggestion of Robert arise? The notion that it was based on a misunderstanding of the line

Thus i robed in russet . romed I aboute,

('Thus yrobed' or 'Thus robed' in other copies), can hardly be accepted; and on the whole I submit that until some further evidence is produced, Robert has a better claim than William to be regarded as the poet's name.

A few words more about Bale's statement. The expression 'in terra lutea' seems to be connected with a false etymology of the name Cleobury, which is given by Crowley as 'Cleybirie.' In Bale's *Index* we find 'in the cley lande' written in English, evidently in

order to call attention to this point. Again, the numeral in his statement of the distance from Cleobury to the Malvern Hills has clearly suffered some corruption, probably in transmission from Brigham to Bale: instead of eight miles, the distance by road would be something like twenty-eight.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

## The Hamlet Quartos, 1603, 1604.

Working recently at the text of the *Merry Wives of Windsor* I came across a small point bearing on the question of the *Hamlet* versions, which does not appear to have been noticed.

I should mention, to begin with, that a careful study of the texts of the *Merry Wives* has forced me to the conclusion that the quarto of 1602 represents a badly corrupted text, obtained from actual performance, of a version in substantial agreement with that preserved in the folio. Now, in the quarto there occurs the line (sig. F 2; l. 1188; Cambridge Shakespeare, ix, 450, l. 42):

What is the reason that you vse me thus?

This line does not appear in the folio text, but it does appear, as Mr P. A. Daniel (in Griggs' facsimile) long ago pointed out, in *Hamlet* (v, i, 312, Globe ed.). The line must, therefore, have been introduced into the *Merry Wives* either by an actor or by the reporter who obtained the copy for press. In either case, since no edition of *Hamlet* had yet appeared, it must have been learned in the playhouse itself. But the line in question differs in the two *Hamlet* versions. In the quarto of 1603 it runs (sig. I 2; Camb. Sh., ix, 745, l. 163; Timmins' parallel texts, p. 90*a*):

What is the reason sir that you wrong mee thus?

while in the quarto of 1604 it runs (sig. N 1; Timmins, p. 90*b*):

What is the reason that you vse me thus?

in which form the line also appears in the folio (sig. pp 6*a*). In this instance, therefore, we can say with certainty that the play as acted on the stage in 1601–2 agreed, not with the text printed in 1603, but with that which first saw the light in 1604. This seems to weigh in favour of the view that the differences between the texts are in part at least due to corruption in the earlier quarto; and I may add that my

own study of the *Merry Wives* has led me to doubt whether any limit can be set to the possible perversion which a text may suffer at the hands of a reporter.

W. W. Greg.

Cambridge.

## Shakespeare, 'Measure for Measure,' II, i, 39.

> Some run from brakes of ice, and answer none,
> And some condemned for a fault alone.

The note by Prof. Gollancz (*Temple Shakespeare*) runs thus:

'The line as it stands in the Folios is obviously corrupt, and has occasioned much discussion. Shakespeare probably wrote "brakes of vice"; *brakes* = thickets, entanglements; "brakes of vice" is antithetical to "a fault alone." Cf. *Henry VIII*, I, ii, 75:

> the rough brake
> That virtue must go through.

The line therefore means "some escape from whole thickets of sin, and pay no penalty." Judging by the passage in *Henry VIII*, "through" for "from" would perhaps be an improvement.'

I wish to draw special attention to this last point. Whatever else may be right, the worst error lies in the absurd word 'from.' To say that a man runs 'from thickets' is obviously absurd. He need not run from a thicket; for it will never chase him!

Of course the right word must be 'through.' Not only have we the above passage from *Henry VIII* to support us, but it is the regular phrase. Are we not familiar with 'Thorough bush, thorough briar' in *M. N. D.*, II, i, 3? And again, 'through brake, through briar' in the same, III, i, 110?

But it is much more to the point to observe that 'run through brakes' was, practically, a proverbial phrase in those days. This we obtain from the play of *The Two Angry Women of Abington*, where 'to run through brakes' means 'to take great risks,' and was a phrase put into the mouth of lovers. Thus, in Act IV, sc. ii, Francis says:

> Well, I may say,
> I have run through the briars for a wench,
> And yet I have her not—the worse luck mine.

And in Act V, sc. i, Mall says:

> I'll run through hedge and ditch, through brakes and briars,
> To come to thee, sole lord of my desires.

And again, without any metaphor at all, in Act III, sc. ii, Mall says:

> Frank, Frank, I come through dangers, death, and harms,
> To make love's patent with my seal of arms.

If we now substitute *through* for *from*, our line becomes

> Some run through brakes of ice, and answer none.

The sense intended is, obviously, 'Some take great risks in love, and yet render account to nobody.' This use of 'answer' occurs in *I Henry IV*, II, iv, 565:

> Send him to answer thee, or any man,
> For anything he shall be charged withal.

The sole remaining difficulty lies in the expression 'of ice.' To substitute the words 'of vice' is surely most inept. The allusion is to *real* brakes, not allegorical merely; it is a comparison, not a figure. Let the *v* alone, and read *ofice* as one word; and surely, this is a mere misreading of *o'fire*. To 'run through brakes' is to take great risks; but 'to run through brakes o'fire' is to take extraordinary risks, and to take them recklessly.

That *o'fire* is a possible Shakespearian spelling may fairly be inferred from *Winter's Tale*, IV, iv, 60, where we find in the first Folio the expression—'her face o' fire.' The usual spelling is *afire*, as in *Cor.* V, iii, 181; or *a fire* (two words), as in *Temp.* I, ii, 212; *Rom.* III, iii, 133.

The reading I propose is, accordingly, the following:

> Well: heauen forgiue him; and forgiue vs all:
> *Some rise by sinne, and some by vertue fall:*
> Some run through brakes o'fire, and answere none,
> And some condemned for a fault alone.

Note that the change made is, really, in a single letter; *r* for *c*. The other alteration, from 'from' to 'through,' is absolutely warranted by the fact that the phrase was proverbial. I should suppose that, when the compositor had misread that *r* as a *c*, he was quite at a loss for the sense, and altered 'through' to 'from' in wild desperation. The fact that the second line is printed in *italics* suggests that some proverb is referred to.

WALTER W. SKEAT.

CAMBRIDGE.

## Some Academic Grammar Plays.

In their account of *Bellum Grammaticale* (*Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* XXXIV, p. 273) Churchill and Keller say, 'Auch ins Englische scheint es übersetzt zu sein; darauf deutet der Titel *The Grammar War* (12°), der sich in dem der Komödie *Lingua*, 1657, angehängten Katalog von Simon Miller in London findet.' The play referred to exists in the British Museum MS. Add. 22725: '*Basileia seu Bellum Grammaticale* Tragico-Comoedia. Sub ferias Nativitatis Acta, à Generosis Scholae Craneburgensis alumnis. An: 1666.' On one of the binding pages is written 'Samuel Hoadley His Book 1667.' On another a second title, 'The warr of Grammar, a Tragick-Comedy Acted by the Scholars of Cranebrook School more than once not without applause. In which the whole vulgar Grammar with something of the Authors own, is festiveously handled.' At the end of the Praeludium comes the announcement, 'Hi ludi in seria ducunt,' which is only too true, for the play, in English, reads almost like a Latin grammar, with frequent question-and-answer dialogue. Though not an exact translation of the earlier Latin play, it appears to be inspired by it, and the *dramatis personae* are for the most part the same. A still later example of this same type of Latin grammar play is the 'Words made Visible: or Grammar and Rhetorick accommodated to the Lives and Manners of Men. Represented in a Country School for the Entertainment and Edification of the Spectators. London, Printed by B. G. for Daniel Major and are to be sold at the Flying-horse in Fleet Street, Dan. Brown next the Queens head without Temple-bar, and Tho. Arrel at the Hand and Scepter in Fleet-street. 1679.' There is a copy of this in the Bodleian. It consists of two parts, neither with any division into acts or scenes. The speakers in the second part are figures of speech; in the first they are almost identical with those of the first two plays mentioned, but less formally designated. For instance, 'Ralph Pone and Jeffery Prae, two Prepositions' are in *Basileia* merely 'Praepositio, Princeps,' and in *Bellum Grammaticale* 'Cis, Regina Praepositionum.' *Words Made Visible* has an interesting preface, from which I quote the following: 'Both parts were composed for private diversion, and acted by the Lads of a Country School, where they received a general applause from Just Hands and Judicious heads, and certainly...such Subjects (as more agreeable) may be as proper, and far more useful than the Bully-tricks of blustring Ajax, a dull

story of an amorous Sot, and a gilting Wench out of Terence, or Plautus, or any the more smutty scenes of latter drammatists;...'

Still another rhetoric drama is 'Princeps Rhetoricus or Πιλομαχία: the Combat of Caps Drawn forth into Arguments, General and Special. In usum Scholae Masonensis: Et In Gratiam totius Auditorii Mercurialis ...London...1648.' This print, of which a copy exists in the King's Library, British Museum, contains little or no text, but is a description in great detail of the arguments, action and costume of the five acts of the play. It is most interesting, and well worth reprinting. The author of the play is John Mason, of Catherine Hall, Cambridge.

Louise B. Morgan.

Bryn Mawr, Pa., U.S.A.

## The Mad Songs in 'The Two Noble Kinsmen.'

In *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, by Shakespeare and Fletcher, there are certain snatches of song sung by the mad daughter of the gaoler, that have not hitherto been identified by any of the editors of the Play.

In Act III, scene 4, she sings:

> For Ile cut my greene coat a foot above my knee,
> And Ile clip my yellow locks an inch below mine e'e:
> Hey nonny, nonny, nonny.

These lines recall a formula that is of frequent occurrence in the ballads. Thus in *Child Waters* (No. 63, Child, version A, from Percy MS., p. 274, Hales and F., ii, 269) stanza 9 runs:

> If you will my ffootpage be, Ellen,
> As you doe tell it me,
> Then you must cutt your gowne of greene
> An inch above your knee.
> Soe must you doe your yellow lockes,
> Another inch above your eye; etc.

(Compare pp. 150 *a*, 165 *b*, and 216 *b*, of the one-volume edition of Child's *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*.)

In the next scene (III, 4) she sings two stanzas from a lost version of a famous old sea-song:

> The George alow! came from the south,
> From the coast of Barbary-a: etc.

with which compare *The Sailor's only delight*, describing the fight between the *George Aloe* and the *Sweepstake*. This ballad will be easily referred to, in Mr Christopher Stone's pleasant collection of

*Sea-Songs and Ballads*, or in Halliwell's *Naval Ballads*, or as No. 285 in Child's volume, p. 610. The ballad was entered on the Stationers' Registers in 1611, and thus may have some significance with regard to the date of the play. The name *George Aloe* has long been a puzzle, but Mr Bullen tells me that somewhere he has seen *George a' Looe* suggested, and this to me seems a perfectly certain explanation of the vessel's name and port.

From this song the mad girl breaks into another:

> There was three fooles fell out about an howlet.
> The one sed it was an owle;
> The other he sed nay;
> The third he sed it was a hawke,
> And her bels were cut away.

This is obviously an earlier version of the nursery rhyme given in Halliwell's *Nursery Rhymes* (No. CCXC, p. 161):

> There were three jovial Welshmen,
> As I have heard them say,
> And they would go a hunting
> Upon St David's day.

These jovial huntsmen find many objects: a ship, the moon, a hedgehog, a hare, and finally 'an owl in a holly tree.'

> One said it was an owl,
> The other he said nay;
> The third said 'twas an old man,
> And his beard was growing grey.

We may ascribe textual variations to the existence of other versions, or to the state of the young lady's mind.

This identification of 'mad songs' illustrates the fact that such songs (as in Ophelia's case also) come from folk-poetry, not from culture-music. They are the songs learnt in childhood and recalled in madness.

H. Littledale.

Cardiff.

# DISCUSSIONS.

## The Authorship of 'Piers the Plowman.'

All students of *Piers the Plowman*, however diverse may be their opinions on the questions treated in Mr Chambers's article in the January number of the *Review*, must, I think, be of one mind in cordially welcoming into their field an investigator of such admirable knowledge, sagacity, and fairness. I had resolved to write no more on the subject for the present, feeling that little substantial progress can be made until the text has been settled by scientific criticism; but as I am one of those whose conclusions have been so powerfully assailed by Mr Chambers, it seems to be incumbent on me to say how far I am prepared to acknowledge the force of his objections, and how far and for what reasons I remain at present of the same opinion as before.

In the first place, I must frankly admit that I was mistaken in asserting that the offences of Robert the Robber have no affinity with the sin of Sloth. It is now clear to me, thanks to Mr Chambers's excellent demonstration, that a mediaeval writer might, without any inappropriateness, have introduced the lament of the Robber as a sequel to the confession of Sloth. Although, as Mr Chambers acknowledges, Robert's offences in themselves come under the head of Covetousness, they are the result of habits of idleness, and it is his neglect to learn an honest trade that renders it impossible for him to make compensation to those whom he has injured. He does not actually fall into 'wanhope,' which is the recognised last and fatal stage in the progress of the slothful, but he is saved from it only by the recollection of the penitent thief, the standard example for the encouragement of those who are on the verge of despair. At the same time, it is worth remembering that in the B-text it is Covetousness, not Sloth, who 'wex into wanhope,' and would have hanged himself if he had not been 'reconforted' by Repentance. It is plain that Robert is meant to represent another and more desperate variety of the same deadly sin which the preceding penitent has confessed; but his character and utterances do not supply any clear grounds for deciding whether that sin was Covetousness or Sloth.

We may, however, find an answer to this question in the preceding lines (A v, 236—241). I fully grant that some kind of promise of restitution might fitly enough conclude the confession of Sloth. But

the promise that appears in these lines is not so worded as to favour the view that it was written for that purpose. Mr Chambers rightly insists that the proper meaning of 'win' is to gain by one's labour—to 'earn,' as Prof. Skeat renders it. For this very reason, the words 'al that I wikkedliche won' would more suitably relate to the results of the mercantile dishonesty to which Covetousness has pleaded guilty, than to those of such transgressions as in the B-text are laid to the charge of Sloth. The added words 'seththe I wit hade' point to a life spent in the deliberate pursuit of gain. It seems to me that 'wicked winning' is properly characteristic of Covetousness in the special form in which it manifests itself in the fraudulent tradesman, the usurer, or one who uses unjustly the opportunities for gain afforded by some regular calling. Although the 'Robert's man' is guilty of Covetousness as well as of Sloth, he belongs not to the tribe of Wynnere, but to that of Wastour.

I think, therefore, that while the lamentation of Robert, taken by itself, might, with equal appropriateness be placed as a pendant to the description of Covetousness or to that of Sloth, the entire passage A v, 236—259 would be improved in fitness if it were transferred to the former position. This was, as is well known, the opinion of C, who is at any rate a good witness with regard to the ideas of the fourteenth century, even if he be not, as some able scholars still believe, the original author himself. But the question is not whether C and certain modern people are right in thinking that a transposition would improve the poem, but whether it is likely that the present arrangement of the text is original. Are the reasons for the negative answer sufficiently weighty to justify us in setting aside the presumption that is rightly held to exist in favour of a traditional text against a mere conjecture? I think they are.

On the assumption that ll. 236—259 were intended to follow l. 235, we are met by a remarkable series of coincidences, which have to be regarded as purely accidental. First, these lines admittedly come in very awkwardly in their supposed original context; and we are to believe that it is by mere chance that when joined to line 145 the passage yields a continuous and satisfactory sense. Secondly, while we might feel only a mild surprise on observing that the poet had omitted to bring the confession of Covetousness to its needful conclusion in a promise of restitution, it is very odd that the deficiency should happen to be just the one which the transposition supplies. Thirdly, the promise made by Sloth happens to be expressed in language which, as I have shown, is unbefitting the character; and it so happens that if Covetousness and not Sloth were the speaker, this language would become perfectly accurate. I am unable to believe that these coincidences are accidental.

But I must not forget that one of the facts assumed in the preceding paragraph has been disputed. It has been said, and by scholars whose opinion I respect, that my proposed transposition does *not* result in a satisfactory sequence; that, in fact, the lines which I would transfer to the confession of Covetousness are inconsistent with those which they

are made to follow. Unfortunately I have failed to discover what my critics mean. Even assuming that the lines 241—2 are genuine, I can perceive no inconsistency. There is some awkwardness, no doubt, in making the penitent swear by the rood of Chester when he has just mentioned the rood of Bromholm. But this does not strike me as a serious difficulty, and it was assuredly not in order to evade it that I suggested that the two lines might be spurious. I think there are very good grounds for suspecting them. Let us consider the facts. The lines in question are as follows:

> And with the residue and the remenaunt · bi the rode of Chester!
> I schal seche seynt Treuthe · er I seo [*or* seche] Rome.

In A vii, 93—4 Piers the Plowman says:

> And with the residue and the remenaunt · bi the rode of Chestre!
> I wol worschupe therwith · Treuthe in my lyue.

Now surely this repetition is more than a little surprising. Mr Chambers suggests that it may have been designed to call attention to the contrast of character between the speakers in the two passages. This is more ingenious than satisfactory. My point is that while the words are perfectly appropriate where they occur in Passus VII—for the thrifty Piers knows that there is a 'residue' at his disposal when his debts are paid—they are quite unsuitable to the penitent (whether his name be Sloth or Covetousness) who in line 236 has just expressed uncertainty whether he will have enough even to compensate those whom he has wronged. If Mr Chambers's conjecture as to the motive of the repetition were intrinsically likely, one might suppose that the poet had inserted the two lines in their earlier unfitting place by an afterthought. But, as is well known, it is a common trick of mediaeval scribes to interpolate matter taken from a different part of the poem which they are copying.

It might perhaps be contended that the poet may originally have written the lines 236—259 at the end of the confession of Covetousness, and afterwards, seeing that some parts of the passage would serve to supplement his scanty description of Sloth, have hastily removed them to their present place, without troubling himself to remedy the inconveniences resulting from the transposition. To those who are convinced that the three recensions of the poem come from one hand, this supposition might prove attractive; it would be exactly in accordance with their view of the author's methods of composition. It will be time to discuss the merits of this solution when some one has seriously advocated it. The hypothesis of a scribal accident is at any rate simpler.

Although I still consider that the evidence for a dislocation of the text is conclusive, I must admit that Mr Chambers has done something to diminish the value of this result as an argument against the unity of authorship of the three forms of the poem. M. Jusserand found it possible to accept the hypothesis of transposition, and yet to maintain

that A, B, and C were the same person. This position will be more easily tenable now that it has been shown that the present arrangement of the text is one that the author might have been content to tolerate if he found it in the copy that lay before him when he came to revise his work. After fifteen years, a writer may well fail to remember so distinctly all the details of his plan as at once to detect any plausible alteration of it. The theory of unity of authorship does not necessarily imply, as some of its advocates suppose, that the elaboration of his early poem was the main preoccupation of William's life during thirty years. It may even be regarded as an argument on the conservative side that the second revision does attempt to remedy some of the faults caused by the dislocation, and that the final revision returns to the original order.

I now come to speak of the omission of the confession of Wrath. Mr Chambers maintains that if we consider the true design of the author, we shall see that this omission may well have been deliberate. He thinks that the comparative fulness or slightness of the treatment of the several sins is proportioned to the relative importance which the poet assigned to them as causes of the evils of his time. This explanation might serve to account for the little space given to Pride and Lechery as compared with Covetousness[1]. But the very meagre handling of Sloth, in contrast with the exuberance of imaginative detail in the description of Gluttony, does not seem equally favourable to Mr Chambers's view. I suspect that the poet troubled himself very little about the proportions of his work, but expatiated freely on those subjects that happened to stimulate his imagination, and dealt more or less perfunctorily with the rest. A careful re-examination of the Passus, in the light of Mr Chambers's remarks, has convinced me that whatever his design may have been, it was intended to be accomplished by showing all the seven sins in order brought to contrition by the preaching of Conscience. Accordingly, when I find that in the existing text Envy shows no penitence, while Wrath does not appear at all, and that both these defects are accounted for by the supposition either of a 'lost leaf,' or of the 'over-hipping' of a leaf by a scribe, I feel constrained to conclude that one of these suppositions is right. As I do not accept Prof. Manly's theory of a lost counterfoil after line 235, I see no reason for preferring either of them to the other.

We have now to consider in what way this result should influence our judgment on the question of the authorship of the B-revision. If the reviser had failed to perceive that the confession of Envy was incomplete, and that that of Wrath was missing, it would be hard indeed to resist the conclusion that he could not be the original author. That he has attempted to supply both gaps is, so far, a point in favour of his identity with the writer of A. On the other hand, although (as the passage about Gluttony shows) the A-poet was not incapable of being led astray from strict artistic propriety when he saw a chance of

[1] Perhaps this is too much to concede. The destructive storm, in the poet's opinion, 'Was aperteliche for pruide · *and for no poynt elles.*'

exercising his gift of humorous description, there is nothing in his work that would lead one to expect from him the curious irrelevance of B's confession of Wrath. I do not forget that a man's mental character may undergo a good deal of change in the course of fifteen years; but I find great difficulty in conceiving that this passage can have been written by the original author. A point not to be overlooked is that the omissions and alterations of the C-text considerably lessen the inappropriateness of the confession.

I have now dealt, to the best of my ability, with all those parts of Mr Chambers's paper which are directed against my own published views. It is not necessary or desirable that I should comment on those of his arguments to which a reply may be expected from Prof. Manly, though on several points I find myself not precisely agreeing with either side. On the general question of the authorship of *Piers the Plowman* I have throughout endeavoured to guard myself against making up my mind too definitely. In spite of certain difficulties, I think that the balance of probability is in favour of a plurality of authors; but this is only a provisional conclusion, and I prefer to abstain from controversy until textual criticism has provided a secure basis for argument.

I should like, however, to call attention to one piece of external evidence, the import of which does not seem to have been correctly apprehended; the testimony, namely, of John But. It is perfectly possible that this testimony is worthless: John But may have been merely guessing in the dark. But it is also possible that he knew what he was talking about; and so long as there is no proof of the contrary, it seems worth while to ascertain precisely what his testimony amounts to. Now, in the first place, I think the natural inference from his statement is that his lines were appended to a MS. containing only the poem of 'Do-wel': that is to say A ix—xii. He indicates that this poem was the last of the three works written by 'Will,' the others being 'Piers the Plowman' and 'The Field of Folk' (*mechel puple*). When he had finished 'that which is here written,' Will died. If John But was correctly informed, the poems contained in the A-text, though they are obviously intended to form a continuous whole, must have been published in three instalments, comprising respectively Passus i—v, vi—viii, and ix—xii. As to the date at which John But wrote there is no certain evidence, except that it was before the deposition of Richard II. The prayer for those who love the king does not prove that the quarrel between the king and his nobles had already begun; but, on the other hand, the prayer might have been uttered by a writer of the Piers Plowman school (even if his opinions were identical with those of the author of *Mum, Sothsegger*) at any time before 1399. But if I am right in supposing that John But wrote when Will's three works still circulated separately, it will be more likely that he is to be placed near the beginning of the reign. It seems clear that he either did not know of the existence of the B and C texts, or regarded them as spurious.

Now, as I have said, the testimony of John But may quite possibly

be worthless; but it is the earliest piece of external evidence that we possess, and it will be well not to reject it without consideration. Of course, if internal evidence clearly demonstrates that A ix—xii cannot have been written by the author of A i—viii, there is an end of the matter; and I think it would be hardly reasonable to accept John But's authority in disproof of Will's authorship of B and C, while rejecting it where it confirms the traditional view. Prof. Manly's arguments for separate authorship of A ix—xii are not yet before the world; they may turn out to be irresistible. But from the mere inferiority of the later poem to its predecessor one can infer nothing. It has happened again and again that a writer has poured out his soul in a work of imagination, worthily embodying the fruit of years of meditation; and afterwards, when the original inspiration was exhausted, has endeavoured ineffectually to follow up his first great success. In A i—viii we have a great though not faultless work of art, with a clear design developed consistently from the germ that was in the writer's mind when he began. We feel that it reaches its predestined conclusion, and that any continuation would be a disfigurement. So, probably, William himself may have felt; and yet it would not be very strange if, after a while, the effect produced by his vision, and the consciousness of obscure thoughts within his own mind, prompted him to take up his pen again, to tell the story of a quest for the meaning of Do-wel, Do-bet, and Do-best, without the long preparation that had gone to the making of his one great work. The author of the poem of Do-wel has obviously no foreseen design; he gropes uncertainly after a solution which never comes in sight; but I do not see in this any reason why he may not be the same man who worked out with such admirable sureness the noble conception of the Vision.

I wish, before concluding this paper, to put in print for the first time a suggestion which has long been present to my mind, and which has been variously received by the scholars to whom I have communicated it privately. This suggestion is that the choice of the name Piers (the popular form of Peter) may have been prompted by the ejaculation 'Peter!' with which the Plowman first enters on the scene. It would of course be impossible to prove that this conjecture is correct, but it seems to me highly probable. If it could be established, it would involve the important consequence that William was indeed the creator of the ideal figure which for centuries influenced so powerfully the thought and life of England, and that he did not, as has often been supposed, merely introduce into literature a name and a conception that were already current among the people when he began to write.

HENRY BRADLEY.

OXFORD.

## Syllables in Verse and Speech.

Although no specialist in such matters, as one much interested in metrical theory, who has read the articles of Professor Thomas on Milton's verse and his subsequent discussion with Mr Omond with pleasure and profit, I should like to be allowed a few words on the vexed question of the syllable. My standpoint is indeed the much-despised one of Phonetics, but no one, I think, will be much offended if I point out that the science of Phonetics may be a useful handmaiden to prosody, a fact which has already been recognized, at any rate in Germany[1], if not in England.

The question of 'elision,' when vowels come together in the poetical line, forms a main bone of contention between Messrs Thomas and Omond. It is one which depends altogether on our definition of the syllable. Grammarians and prosodists have altogether failed to give an exact conception of what a syllable is. That has on the other hand been done by a certain school of phoneticians. May I point out their solution of the question, and also that it can be applied to show that as regards the contest between Professor Thomas and Mr Omond *both* are, in a sense, in the right?

Sievers has shown[2] that what we call syllables in language depend on our impression of what we hear. For our linguistic sense sounds in contact with one another either coalesce or are separate under certain conditions which may be closely defined. They are shortly as follows:

1. If two sounds are separated from one another by another sound of less sonority than either, we have the impression of each being in a different syllable, e.g., English *ready*, which is a dissyllable because the vowels on either side are more sonorous than the consonant itself.

2. A difference in sonority may be the result of a decrescendo-crescendo movement of the force (i.e., loudness) with which sounds are pronounced. If we for example sing the vowel *a* on a prolonged note, and alternately make it softer and louder, we notice that it is divided into different syllables (pictorially $\widetilde{a\text{-}a\text{-}a\text{-}a}$...).

It is obvious that words may be divided into syllables in either way, or in both concurrently.

In consequence of the above, when vowels come in contact with one another without the intervention of a less sonorous sound, they must either (1) coalesce into a diphthong or triphthong, forming one syllable, or (2) be separated as in the second case above, thus forming two or more syllables.

When two vowels come together as in *to atone*, the decision whether they will coalesce into a diphthong forming one syllable, or not coalesce, rests with the speaker. If the speaker consciously tries to mark the boundary between the two different words, he will separate the vowels by the means shown above. If he does not do this, he generally allows

[1] See Saran's epoch-making book, *Deutsche Verslehre*, Munich, 1907.
[2] See *Grundzüge der Phonetik*, 5th ed., Kap. 25.

them *unconsciously* to coalesce. It must here be remembered that a person speaking naturally under ordinary circumstances is *not* conscious of the word-boundaries. In such cases therefore he as a rule does allow vowels to coalesce.

I assert therefore that nine Englishmen out of ten make a dissyllable of *to atone*, in other words they pronounce the vowel of *to* and the first vowel of *atone* as a diphthong (= ua[1]).

Mr Omond seems to be conscious of this to a certain extent when he claims that the vowels are 'slurred,' or that two syllables are pronounced in the time of one. If he does not recognize that we really have only one syllable in such a case, it is probably because the diphthongs which occur in this way are often quite different from the ordinary diphthongs to which we are accustomed in our spelling of words. The diphthong *ua* so spelt does not occur in our spelling of English: it is nevertheless just as much a diphthong in the case quoted above as the *ua* of South German *fuas* (= *Fusz*, Middle High German *vuoz*), or the *ēo* of Old English *bēodan*; and apart from spelling it occurs in the South English pronunciation of *pure*, etc. The question of time has nothing to do with the matter, because *to atone* as a trisyllable does not require any more time to pronounce than as a dissyllable. Another reason why Mr Omond goes wrong in his terminology here (I think his *feeling* for the phenomena is quite correct), is that he regards English as intolerant of elision. This is not always so, nor does the example Mr Omond quotes (English *idea-r-of it*) prove what he thinks. The explanation of the *r* in that example is the same as that given by Paul for the insertion of *r* (or *n*) in various South German dialects under similar circumstances[2]. Southern English pronunciation has two forms for words ending in an *r*. The *r* is dropped before another consonant, but preserved before a vowel (e.g., *I fea(r) to*, but *the fear of*). The diphthong in *fear* (*ia*) is very common before *r*, but rare elsewhere in English. It is not surprising then that this word follows the analogy of *fear of*. That this is the correct explanation is proved by the fact that those varieties of English pronunciation which preserve an *r* under all conditions never add one to *idea*. No Irishman or Scotchman uses *r* to avoid a hiatus, in *the idea of it*, nor is he conscious of a hiatus in that case or any other, where two vowels come together. The sense of hesitancy, which is termed a feeling of hiatus is entirely a question of habit, it can only arise for the natural speaker when two vowels come together which form a very rare diphthongal combination in his own language. None of the examples quoted by Mr Omond seem to me to belong to that category.

I venture to hope that Mr Omond will find in the above remarks some indication of 'what precisely takes place when two syllables are, as we phrase it, slurred together,' at least so far as vowels are concerned. He will perhaps realize that it is quite a simple matter to pronounce *Adria* as a dissyllable.

[1] In phonetical transcription: uə.

[2] Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, 4th ed., pp. 118–19.

As regards the historical question of elision, I think that every one with some knowledge of the history of the English language will admit that Professor Thomas is right. Milton must have accepted a great many elisions which are foreign to modern speakers. So far as the *number of syllables in the line* is concerned, this is however of little importance: whether we pronounce *to atone* as Mr Omond would have us do, or as *tàtone*, it remains a dissyllable.

If prosodists would only remember that what appears a syllable in print is not necessarily one in speech, and accustom themselves to analyzing what they *hear* rather than what they *read*, difficulties like the above would be much easier dealt with. Saran is surely right: 'Die Hauptsache ist und bleibt aber: man gewöhne sich daran, Verse mit dem Ohre aufzufassen, sie rein nach dem Klang, ohne den Umweg übers Papier, zu analysieren.'

R. A. Williams.

Dublin.

## The Date of 'The Chances.'

I am quite of Mr Macaulay's mind that, in all the circumstances, it is impossible to assign an early date to *The Chances*; and his judgement that the style of the play belongs to the last period of Fletcher's development is necessarily of weight. But I am not prepared to admit that the gossip about baiting the Pope's bulls and the troops of the Duke of Lorraine has no topical significance. I think that Mr Macaulay's suggestion that the prologue indicates a posthumous production shows the way out of the difficulty. Not merely was the play posthumous, but the particular passage which has puzzled me was inserted by another hand than Fletcher's. It dates from 1627. The government of Charles I, under pressure from the Puritans, issued on 3 November 1625 a commission for putting into force the penal laws against the recusants. This awoke a controversy between Rome and England, which had slumbered since 1609. A *breve* or bull against the oath of allegiance was published by Urban VIII on 30 May 1626. This in its turn led to the composition of a polemical tract by Henry Burton, rector of St Matthew's, Friday Street. It was published in 1627 and cost Burton a summons before the Privy Council. The following is its title—*The Baiting of the Popes Bull. An vnmasking of the Mystery of iniquity, folded vp in a most pernitious Breeue or Bull, sent from the Pope lately into England, to cawse a Rent therein, for his Reentry. With an advertisement to the Kings seduced subiects.* A woodcut on the title-page represents King Charles striking a horned Pope upon the forehead. I add that in the spring of 1627 Charles was preparing for war with France, and sent Walter Montagu, although fruitlessly, to negotiate for the help of the Duke of Lorraine.

E. K. Chambers.

Gerrard's Cross.

# REVIEWS.

*Elizabethan Drama*, 1558–1642. *A History of the Drama in England from the Accession of Queen Elizabeth to the Closing of the Theaters.* By Felix E. Schelling. 2 Vols. London: Constable, 1908. 8vo. xliii + 606, and x + 685 pp.

No one in any way conversant with the subject will doubt there being ample room for a comprehensive history of the Elizabethan drama—a history that shall at once supply an ordered view over the field and embody the results of modern research. Nor will such a person doubt the immense difficulties of the task. It is hard enough to obtain a clear and sure grasp of the subject oneself; it is doubly difficult adequately to expound it to others. The work requires many and rare qualities and requires them in a high degree. Professor Schelling certainly possesses the least dispensable of all—appreciation. The degree in which he possesses others naturally varies, but it may be said at once that he has carried through his work in a manner that is in general eminently satisfactory, and in such an undertaking not to have failed wholly is already to have achieved a not inconspicuous success.

Not least among Professor Schelling's qualifications—though it is the fashion in certain quarters to sneer at it—is his familiarity with even the less important of modern critical work upon the subject with which he deals. Thus, though his own analysis may seldom be very profound, he is usually able to direct attention to what is most significant in the research that has been done on any particular problem[1]; and certainly one of the most useful portions of his work is the exhaustive Bibliographical Essay which fills over a hundred pages of small print in the second volume. Moreover, the writer has his materials at his fingers' ends; he does not trust, like some, to notes which fail him at the critical moment, nor, like others, rely in one place on evidence which he elsewhere recognises as forged, or endeavour

[1] Indeed, in his desire to include the very latest information, he is occasionally a little more than up to date. In the bibliography will be found references to Gollancz' edition of *Gismond of Salern*, 1893 (ii, 462), Methuen's facsimile of the 1632 folio of *Shakespeare*, 1906 (ii, 476), and Herford and Simpson's *Jonson*—'2 vols. having already appeared'—(ii, 499), none of which had been published at the date of issue. Readers may also be a little inclined to resent being told to 'see' an unpublished thesis (ii, 5), even if it is extant in the Harvard library.

to work in the results of recent research while avoiding the unpleasant necessity of reconsidering his own opinion.

On the other hand, there is one defect in Professor Schelling's work, which it may be very easy to understand and to forgive in the case of a scholar on the other side, but of which criticism is nevertheless bound to take account. This is a tendency to rely, in the case of the less accessible texts, upon second-hand knowledge. A trifling instance is the statement (ii, 2) that Lady Lumley's translation of the *Iphigenia* [*at Aulis*] is in Latin. The error is as old as the Catalogue of Royal MSS., but error it is, for the translation is in English[1]. It is happily true that this is a matter which has of late years become of less importance, as more and more texts have been published, as a rule under increasingly competent editorship; but the consideration still remains of weight, for whether or not the time will ever come when the serious historian, of even so limited a field as the drama, will be safe in neglecting unpublished sources, it may with confidence be said that it is not at present in sight. It must unfortunately be admitted that in this respect a very bad example has been set by some recent writers who cannot put in the American professor's plea for indulgence. It is unusual now-a-days to hear much good of J. P. Collier, and yet one of the most striking features of the work in which he sketched the outlines of English dramatic history, is the intimate knowledge he shows of all manner of unedited texts and documents. In their more detailed surveys, later historians have but too often contented themselves with mere reproduction of Collier's work, and this even in cases in which the texts in question had meanwhile become comparatively accessible.

There are a few minor objections that might be raised—for instance to certain Transatlantic expressions which will certainly irritate readers in this country, to some slipshod writing and some injudicious metaphors, to occasional instances of ethical irrelevance which make the reader rejoice that they are not more frequent—but it would be more than ungracious to dwell upon them. In general the author's qualifications are what we should desire. He writes with knowledge and grasp, ease and clearness; his book is fresh in its treatment and comprehensive in its scope.

The most striking feature of the work and the one which most obviously challenges criticism is the arrangement of the material according to types, to the exclusion of the strictly chronological or biographical method. It is curious that Professor Schelling has nowhere discussed the merits of his method in detail, but casually mentions near the end of his second volume (p. 393) that 'the classification of the drama by species' is 'one of the chief purposes of this book.' American scholars have of late rather taken the literary type under their protection and they have certainly produced some interesting results,

[1] Incidentally be it noted that the press-mark of the Royal MS. at the B.M. is not xv, A, but 15. A. ix., and that Lady Lumley died, not in March 1576, but in March 1576/7, being buried on the 9th.

though how far the method can be applied with advantage in such a case as the present is a question upon which one may be allowed to reserve judgement. In principle the method, of course, substitutes longitudinal for the more familiar transverse divisions, but in practice the difference between the two is much obscured. Clear lines of longitudinal cleavage such as that between tragedy and comedy are rare, the more particularized sorts—domestic tragedy, romance, comedy of humours, and the like—each in turn arise and have their day and vanish, so that, in fact, this method of subdivision tends to compromise with the other and produces a sort of pseudo-stratification, and it is perhaps this alone that makes its adoption in such a case as the present possible.

The method, like all methods, has its disadvantages, and it must be admitted that they seem rather serious. In general it may be said that such classification tends, on the one hand, to obscure the qualities which plays of one group have in common with those of another, qualities due to common age, authorship or conditions, thus losing sight of the general trend of dramatic mutation in the minuter study of the variation of individual species; and, on the other hand, to rob the individual of its individuality by insistence on its conformity to a type. We know how dangerous may be the labels of systematists even in natural science: in such a subject as literature the danger is increased tenfold. The comedy of humours, of character, of manners, of incident, of situation, of sentiment—all these distinctions are but labels, convenient perhaps for the nonce to describe a specimen, but most mischievous if permanently attached to it. A practical difficulty in the present case arises from the fact that the chronological element, expressing itself in the surroundings, and the personal element of authorship, cannot be wholly neglected. The result is that we find fragments of stage history and fragments of biographical lore scattered almost at random throughout the volumes. With his attention fixed on the question of types the reader feels these to be mere disturbing irrelevancies, while as history and biography they are necessarily divorced from much of the matter that would illustrate them and that they are supposed to illustrate. The author has, no doubt, himself felt the difficulties of his arrangement, and he even seems to confess to some misgiving. Thus he writes (i, 576) that '*Lear* and *Macbeth*, though both transcend mere legend, as they rise in splendid isolation above all drama classified by form or kind, have likewise been logically treated among English historical dramas.' It may be logical to treat *Lear* as one would treat *Locrine*, but it seems unreasonable to suppose that the source of the materials is of any significance for the form of Shakespeare's tragedies. The subject-matter is only of importance when it is the source of a difference of treatment; and a classification based on fortuitous characteristics must of necessity be vicious.

On the other hand, the arrangement has also unquestionable merits. Beside the more obvious advantage of enabling similar plays to be treated together, it has the power of bringing out unsuspected con-

nections and relations which throw a good deal of light on the history of the various kinds. An instance may be found in the suggestion that the Shakespearian revision of *Hamlet* and Jonson's additions to the *Spanish Tragedy* may have been due to the popularity of young Marston's revival of an earlier type of drama, the tragedy of revenge (i, 558). So, again, at a later date, 'It may not be too much to affirm that the ease, originality, and naturalness of this one popular play [the *Maid's Tragedy*], coming when it did, turned the current of romantic tragedy from the noise and hysterics of Marston and from the elaborate horrors of Webster and Tourneur to the easy eloquence of Massinger and to Shirley's consummate simplicity of plot' (i, 597). Neither should the interesting distinction between the earlier and later schools of Senecan playwrights be overlooked (ii, 7), nor the passage (ii, 204) in which a view of the relation of the Shakespearian romances to those of Beaumont and Fletcher is advanced in opposition to that maintained by Professor Thorndike. Thus it will be seen that the writer has been frequently able to impart an original interest to his treatment and to throw fresh and welcome light on certain formal transitions. But he has garnered; and while in future there will be no excuse for historians if they neglect the help which the method of comparison by types has to offer, it may be doubted whether they will be well advised to pursue that method themselves in the presentation of their material.

No one will expect to find in these volumes a final treatment of the subject, nor can it be said that they in any way mark an epoch in the history of scholarship, or contribute in any very marked manner to our knowledge of the literary field which they cover. But they present on the whole an admirable survey of the present state of that knowledge, and as such they will be most welcome to students. As one may be allowed to hope that an opportunity for revision will occur, perhaps the best compliment I can pay Professor Schelling's work will be to devote the remainder of my space to pointing out certain passages, which either contain manifest errors or which might possibly, as it appears to me, benefit by reconsideration.

There are in the first place certain general criticisms to be made[1]. We may, for example, complain of an occasional want of precision. In a number of passages works are quoted by wrong or at least misleading titles. Bullen's *Dialogue of Death* (i, 61) should be *Dialogue against the Fever Pestilence* (at least that is the shortened title by which it is commonly known); *Gli Hecatommithi* (i, 210) is not the title of 'a novel of Cinthio's,' but of a collection like the *Decameron*; a play, which I suppose to be Barnes' *Devil's Charter*, is disguised as *Pope Alexander VI* (i, 569); the time-honoured error of calling Cowley's play *The Cutter of Colman Street* ('Cutter' being the name of a character) is repeated

[1] The proof-reading on the whole is good, though there are a few passages in which the sense is more or less seriously obscured by small typographical errors. There are also a certain number of misprints: *Litteraturbibliothek* for *Literaturblatt* (ii, 442), *Les Débat* for *Les Débuts* (ii, 461), and *Manuele* for *Manuale* (ii, 487) all occur in the Bibliography.

(ii, 88); and Habington's *Queen of Aragon* receives the title of *Cleodora* (ii, 368). Were the writer to quote *Hamlet* under the title of the *Prince of Denmark* there would be little objection, but in the case of the obscurer plays such perversity is really not fair on the reader.

A more serious defect is a tendency often observable to treat points of controversy as settled, which have in fact been little more than raised, and otherwise to put forward hasty conclusions based on inadequate evidence. Peele's authorship of *Locrine* is more than once positively asserted (i, 98, 136), and so is Greene's of *George-a-Green* (i, 259), though on either attribution much might be written, and the latter seems, to me at least, highly improbable. Again, the reader is a little tempted to rebel when *Mucedorus* is said to be founded on an episode in Sidney's *Arcadia*, apparently on the strength of an unpublished Chicago essay (i, 241)[1]. It may be so—the assertion has been freely made before, though never substantiated—but one would like to see the essay in question. Several hasty assertions occur in connection with Nashe's often perplexing works. The traditional interpretation of his jibe at 'Idiote art-masters' as referring to Marlowe is repeated (i, 229), as usual without notice of Nashe's explicit denial. So again (i, 215) certain 'historic doubts' as to the interpretation of the Kidde-Hamlet passage are said to have been 'definitively laid to rest by J. W. Cunliffe,' though how far this is from being the case can be seen from R. B. McKerrow's notes on the passage. 'Definitive' is also the adjective applied to the papers by Fuller and Baker on the sources of *Titus Andronicus* (ii, 465). I can only say that, after going very carefully into these in connection with Henslowe's Diary, I entirely disagree with the writer's conclusions. Really 'definitive' and 'final' are words which ought to be expunged from the critical vocabulary. I think I may the less invidiously, as well as the more feelingly, protest, in that the objectionable epithet is applied to a harmless and unpretending essay of my own. *Titus* has, of course, been a rock of offence to many, and it is impossible not to feel that Professor Schelling's magisterial pronouncements in favour of 'unmistakable traces of the master's regulating hand' (i, 221) are out of place in such a work as this, and on a subject on which the acutest judges have held such opposite views. There is the less reason for treating the writer leniently on this point, in that he has for once spoken without acquainting himself with recent research. By far the most important work on the subject is J. M. Robertson's book. This the Professor has calmly neglected. It is unmentioned in his footnotes, and the record of it in the bibliography is obviously second-hand. It runs (ii, 465): 'The latest word on the topic is that of J. M. Robertson, "Did Shakespeare write *Titus Andronicus*?" *Modern Language Review*, i, 1905; and see, also, W. W. Greg in the next number of the same.' Upon which I need only remark that the article in *M.L.R.*, i, [4], 1905 [rather July, 1906] is not Mr Robertson's work, but my review of it, while the note 'in the next number,' i.e., Oct. 1906, is not mine at all,

[1] Published by the University of Nevada, since this was written, but I have not yet seen it.

but Mr Robertson's reply. Professor Schelling should remember that in a text book such as his, scholarship is best served, not by arraying vague probability or possibility in the garb of ascertained fact, but by indicating alternatives and leaving questions open.

Another group of errors, more or less serious, is connected with theatrical history. The subject is, of course, one of exceptional difficulty, in which trustworthy guides are few, but when Professor Schelling begins by describing Ordish's superficial compilation as a 'scholarly work' he raises grave misgivings in any serious student. I will mention a few points rapidly. The Queen's men certainly did not break up in the beginning of 1592 (i, 144), for they were acting at Court and at the Rose early in 1594, and may possibly be traceable as a travelling company down to 1602. There is no likelihood of Shakespeare having ever belonged to Leicester's company (*ibid.*). The statement that 'on the death of Leicester, September 4, 1588, Edward Alleyn formed a new company under the patronage of Ferdinando, Lord Strange' (*ibid.*) is quite baseless. Alleyn was probably with Worcester's men till February 22, 1589, and then became a servant of the Lord Admiral. It is true that he led Strange's men at a time of partial amalgamation of the two companies, but there is no indication that he founded that body. The automatic closing of playhouses on account of plague (p. 148) is not heard of till 1603; the number of plague-deaths was then fixed at 30, the number 40 being first found in 1619. Southwark did not include the whole of the south bank of the river, as implied on p. 155. It certainly extended nowhere near Newington, and it is important to remember that even the Rose was not technically within the borough of Southwark, which was subject to the jurisdiction of the City, but in the Liberty of the Clink. The statement that the Swan 'was built on the site of the old Paris Garden,' i.e., the Bear Garden, is incorrect (p. 155). The Swan was built in the Liberty of Paris Garden about 1596; the Bear Garden, which survived till converted into the Hope in 1613, was in the Liberty of the Clink. This of course disposes of the subsequent statement (p. 157) that both the amphitheatres on the Bankside were replaced by playhouses. The 'bull-baiting' merely disappeared. It is very doubtful whether the octagonal form of playhouse can be regarded as transitional from the square inn-yard (p. 158); the modern equivalent of the 'rooms' are called boxes, not stalls, in this country, whatever they may be in America; and 'cupola' is a singularly inapplicable term to apply to the square turret which surmounted many of the Elizabethan theatres (p. 159). The remarks (p. 173) about gallants sitting on the stage and groundlings standing in the pit should be reconsidered, since the former practice was very likely confined to the private houses (even if not peculiar to the Blackfriars) while the latter was distinctive of the public theatres. With what companies 'other' than Shakespeare's were the actors enumerated on p. 188 'later' connected? We most certainly should not 'trust' Collier's interpretation of the 'plattes' as being the outlines of impromptu plays (p. 196), since

one of them, the *Battle of Alcazar*, is extant in a printed quarto. If the statement (p. 472) that the Chamberlain's men 'acted continuously at the Globe' 'from 1599 to the close of the reign' is correct, then the suggestion (p. 494) that they were with Fletcher at Aberdeen in Oct. 1601 must be wrong. Quite possibly both assumptions may be false. The identity of Pembroke's and Worcester's companies, asserted on p. 495, is problematic, not to say improbable. The remark (ii, 376) that the only allusion to Jonson as an actor is in *Satiromastix* overlooks Henslowe's mention of 'Bengemen Johnson player' (*Diary*, p. 234).

One other group of errors requires attention, and here, although one need not apply so strict a criterion in the present case as one would in that of an English writer, it is impossible to acquit the author of very considerable carelessness and neglect of ordinary sources of information. I refer to the extraordinary confusion between the universities of Oxford and Cambridge and their respective colleges which appears in the chapter on the academic drama (see also in vol. i, pp. 86 and 107). It would be mere waste of time to point out here in detail the constant confusion of Christ Church and Christ's College, the absurd assignment of *Gammer Gurton* to Oxford and the Gager-Rainolds controversy to Cambridge—five minutes' conversation with anyone moderately conversant with the subject, or the use of any work of reference, will enable the writer to clear his pages of a score or so of blunders. A few more recondite errors may be singled out, for the detection of most of which I am indebted to Professor Moore Smith. Thus the statement that at the universities 'scarcely a winter passed without performances, far more of them (it may be surmised from the many manuscripts yet extant) than have been handed down in the records' (ii, 58), is daring, considering the writer's complete ignorance of the 'records.' The exact reverse is in fact true: the extant manuscripts represent but a very small proportion of the plays, usually unnamed, of whose performance the records give evidence. I am glad of this opportunity of referring to a paper in the *Fasciculus Ioanni Willis Clark dicatus* (Cantabrigiae, 1909) in which G. C. M. Smith has collected some of the results of his laborious researches. Since, however, the list stops at 1585, a considerable proportion of the pieces recorded are classical. Lastly, in the catalogue of 'Latin college plays of the reign of James' given at p. 75 of vol. ii, Atkinson's *Homo* should be assigned to Oxford not Cambridge, and *Æmelia* should be *Æmilia* On p. 81 'Reynolds'' is presumably a misprint for 'Randolph's.'

It remains to go through Professor Schelling's pages and indicate a number of miscellaneous points of varying degrees of importance which seem open to criticism.

Vol. i, p. 202, note. 'the mark "ne" interpreted, according to Collier and Greg, to mean "new enterlude."' 'New enterlude' is the interpretation of Malone and Fleay; Collier conjectured 'ne[w]'; I have avoided expressing any opinion on the subject.

p. 228. 'Muly Abdelmilech may readily have been so disguised [Mulomorco] in Henslowe's free orthography and pronunciation.' If

so, anything may be anything. 'Mulomorco,' however (which, by the way, is not among the forms used by Henslowe, though these range from 'mvlomvrco' to 'mvlo mvllocco'), is a perversion of the character name Muly Mollocco, and the identification of the play with the extant *Battle of Alcazar* is somewhat uncertain.

p. 289. 'Fleay's identification of the [*Whore of Babylon*] with *Truth's Supplication to Candlelight*...seems sheer guesswork.' In a manner all such identifications are guesswork, but the present instance is well substantiated. In 1607 (not 1604) we find Dekker, after a quarrel with the actors, publishing a play performed by Henslowe's company, the Prince's, and at his house, the Fortune, which must have been as old as c. 1600 and which contains a character Time: in 1600 we find Dekker writing for Henslowe's company, the Admiral's, and for his house, the Rose, a play with a very appropriate title, and at the same time we find Henslowe purchasing 'a Robe for time.'

p. 480. 'Marston, who is alluded to by Henslowe in September, 1599, as "the new poete."' Henslowe calls the new poet 'maxton' and though it is possible that Marston may be intended, it is well to bear in mind that the interlineation 'mastone' is probably a forgery.

p. 530, note. 'The date, 1609, of the title-page [to *Epicoene*] of the folio [of 1616] reckons old style.' The term 'old style' properly applies to the Julian calendar and is incorrectly (if commonly) used to indicate the Marian year. Moreover the statement itself is incorrect. A. H. Thorndike has conclusively shown that Jonson began the year on 1 January (*Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher*, p. 17).

p. 589. 'the politic brothers.' I cannot imagine who is intended. Or does the author merely mean 'fellows in intrigue'?

Vol. ii, p. 17. How can Lodge's *Wounds of Civil War* (not *Wounds of the Civil Wars*, by the way), assigned to c. 1588, be 'the earliest extant play in English on a Roman subject,' when *Appius and Virginia* was printed as early as 1575?

It is perhaps natural that a good many of the points on which I differ from Professor Schelling should occur in his chapter on the Pastoral Drama. But it may be all the more desirable that I should mention them[1]. Thus on p. 144 we read: 'the *Aminta* was translated first into Latin by Thomas Watson in 1585.' This is a time-honoured blunder and a bad one. Koeppel, to whose article in *Anglia* the writer refers, gives a perfectly correct account of the matter, in the course of which he questions whether Watson had so much as a model besides Vergil, and I do not understand why almost every subsequent writer has erred. It is apparently Mr Sidney Lee who is responsible. P. 145. 'The device of Echo is equally Italian, though not to be

[1] The author explains that his chapter was already in print before he saw my book on the subject—a work for which I fear he entertains an exaggerated regard. But he quotes it freely in his notes, and this being so it is rather confusing to find that he also refers to an early magazine article of mine on the same subject, while it is hardly fair to write (p. 164): 'neither Smith nor Greg include *Sicelides* in their lists of English pastorals,' a statement which is only true of the article, not of the book.

found in Guarini's play.' It is there safe enough: *Pastor Fido*, IV, viii. P. 152. Heywood's *Amphrisa* 'is a translation pure and simple.' This is an interesting statement, and would have been more so had the author informed us what the original is. It escaped the researches of W. Bang. P. 158. '*The Faithful Shepherdess* was acted in 1608 and first printed the following year.' The date 1608 is also given on p. 412, but 1609 on p. 417. It may have been printed at any time before May 1610. The date of composition is not known, but the arguments for 1608 are unconvincing. We have no right to date it before 1609. P. 159. 'The Faithful Shepherdess is Clorin.' Why not just as well Amoret? 'A gentle Satyr on whose original nature devotion to this pure mistress has wrought a miracle.' That was only a delusion of Clorin's vanity and is cynically discountenanced by the poet. P. 178. '*Scyros* by Samuel Brooke, acted at Cambridge in 1612, and not improbably a...translation or adaptation of Bonarelli's *Filli di Sciro*.' Elsewhere (p. 144) we read: 'Apparently the only other pastoral drama [besides the *Aminta* and the *Pastor Fido*] translated in England was Luigi Groto's *Pentimento Amoroso*.' (This is anyhow incorrect, for the *Filli* was translated both by Sidnam and Talbot.) I do not understand this scepticism as to the identity of *Scyros* and *Filli*. It is true that if Professor Schelling's suggestion that they might be the same was original, it was a creditable guess. But he refers in his note to my *Pastoral Drama*, where the fact is explicitly stated. To remove any possible doubt, I here transcribe, from the Trinity MSS. of the play, the passage corresponding to that which I used in my book to illustrate the English versions.

> *Cæ.* Ibi me ad arboris ambesæ truncum ligat: postea
> Vna raptura vestes mihi a collo ad talos dilacerat.
> *Ch.* Omnes? *Cæ.* Omnes. *Ch.* O Cælia mea! *Cæ.* Iam tecum reputes,
> Annon pudori timor, et pallor huic purpuræ
> Quam merito cesserit! *Ch.* Oihme! *Cæ.* Hic Dianam invoco,
> Et cælo attollo manus, atque vocem emitto acerrime!...
> Oculos quippe claudebam stulta, acsi ita licuisset mihi
> Corpus nudum velare demittendo palpebras.

Brooke, it will be seen, has to some extent broken up the long narrative speeches of the original into dialogue, and he has not hesitated to make alterations, when he saw an opportunity of removing the grosser fatuities of the Italian, but his work remains strictly translation. There is a blunder on the same page (178, note) which Professor Schelling seems to father on me, but which I must repudiate. He says that another translation of the *Filli* 'was made in 1655 "by J. S."' The translation in question, by Sidnam, was printed in 1655 with an explicit statement (to which I called attention) that it had been 'made' some twenty years before.

As was only to be expected, the valuable Bibliographical Essay contains a certain number of errors. I will mention such as I have noticed. P. 446. The 'Enterlude' printed by the Malone Society is *Johan the Evangelist* not *Johan Baptistes*: it has no connection with

Bale's piece. P. 450. There is no such piece as the *Play of Lucre*: the writer means the *Play of Lucres* or *Lucrece*. P. 460. A new edition of the *Revels Accounts* by Mrs Stopes is promised. The plan has presumably been superseded by A. Feuillerat's labours. On the same page an important article on the Court Performances in *M.L.R.*, ii, 1906 (p. 1) is ascribed to me by error for E. K. Chambers. P. 471. The relation of *Locrine* to *Selimus* is treated far more confidently than the facts warrant, and no mention is made of Charles Crawford's researches (*Collectanea*, 1906, i, 47). P. 479. The *Earl of Huntingdon* plays are more accessible in Hazlitt's Dodsley (1875) than in Collier's *Five Old Plays* (1833). P. 483. The author gives no reason for his ascription of the 'unsatisfactory' Pearson reprint of Dekker's plays to R. H. Shepherd. It is very likely correct, but what is the authority? Lastly on p. 514 there is another instance of hasty pronouncement, where the late J. Churton Collins is said to have 'substantiated' a conclusion on the subject of Shakespeare's learning 'the reverse of Farmer's.' It may be admitted that recent critics have shown that some modification of the position taken up in Farmer's brilliant but rather dogmatic essay is necessary, but to assert anything more than this is the height of temerity.

Professor Schelling's List of Plays should prove of great value to students, in spite of some inaccuracies. The author of *Albumazar* was Thomas Tomkis, not J. Tomkins (see also ii, 78: the error is mine and I renounce it). The British Museum MS., Add. 10,444, which is frequently quoted, contains the names of an enormous number of 'masques' (far more than are here recorded), but it is very doubtful whether they should appear in the list, for they seem to be mere dances and have no necessary connection with dramatic shows at all (see my *Pastoral Drama*, p. 383, note 3). The poem entered as *Amyntas, The Lamentations of*, is in no way dramatic. The entry: *Catilina Triumphans* 'MS. in Trinity College Library, Cambridge,' copied from Halliwell and Hazlitt, seems to be wrong. The MS. may be at Oxford or Dublin. *John the Evangelist* is not a fragment.

The Index is admirably full. I would only suggest that where several references are given, the main passage in which a work is discussed should either be put first or else should be distinguished by different type. The more important entries are analysed; but eleven references are given under *Campaspe*, twelve under *Cymbeline*, thirteen under *Every man in* and *Every man out of his Humour* respectively. To a student desiring to look up what the author has to say concerning any given play, a dozen references are hardly more helpful than none at all.

I have perhaps shown that there are points in Professor Schelling's work that stand in need of correction: let me repeat that it is a work well worth correcting.

W. W. Greg.

Cambridge.

*The Poetical Works of Giles and Phineas Fletcher.* Edited by F. S. Boas. 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1908–09. 8vo. xxi + 310, xxiii + 368 pp.

This admirable edition of the poems of the brothers Fletcher forms a peculiarly appropriate addition to a series of 'Cambridge' English Classics, for nearly every poem included in it was originally published—to quote from the title-page of Phineas Fletcher's *Sylva Poetica*,—'Cantabrigiæ, ex Academiæ celeberrimæ typographeo.' There was real need for a new critical edition of the two brothers' works, as they have been generally accessible hitherto only in Dr Grosart's editions. Mr Boas pays due tribute to Grosart's immense industry and enthusiasm, but justifies his own labours by allusion to his predecessor's well-known limitations as editor and critic. Mr Boas himself, as his prefaces will show, went about his task with enthusiasm, and he has spared no pains in producing, both from manuscript and printed sources, a thoroughly scholarly text of the poems. Although first attracted to his work by the poems of Giles, he found that Phineas provided far more knotty problems for a textual editor. What Mr Boas claims to have achieved in his two volumes is best stated in his own words. 'The tracing of the evolution of *Locustæ* through its various stages; the reconstitution of the text of *Sicelides* by a collation of the Quarto with the MSS.; the presentation of the shorter poems in an accurate reprint; the systematic analysis of the "reproductions" in Phineas' poetry; and the revindication of his claim to the authorship of *Britain's Ida*—all these have been attempted in this edition.' In two of the tasks here recounted Mr Boas had been largely anticipated by Grosart, but he has dealt with both more systematically and in much greater detail. Phineas's habit of economising his materials extended even to 'repeating almost *verbatim*, with only the changes necessitated by metre or by general setting, passages from his own works.' Such repetitions are found not only, as might be expected, in *Sicelides* and the *Piscatorie Eclogs*, but there are remarkable correspondences between passages in the fisher-play and lines in *The Purple Island* and the *Poeticall Miscellanies*. Grosart notes this peculiarity of the poet, but Mr Boas instances a number of remarkable 'reproductions' which had apparently escaped Grosart's notice. Mr Boas builds on another foundation provided by Grosart in his vindication of Phineas Fletcher's authorship of *Britain's Ida*. He has, however, massed his proofs so convincingly as to leave no further room for the doubts which Grosart's arguments from internal evidence left in the minds of many competent critics. This poem, dealing in six brief cantos with the story of Venus and Adonis, was, as all students of Fletcher's works know, printed in 1628 for Thomas Walkley as the work of 'that Renowned Poet, Edmond Spencer.' No critic of any authority has ever accepted the Spenserian authorship of the poem, and Thomas Warton was apparently the first to hint at Fletcher's probable authorship by pointing out, in his *Observations on the Fairy Queen*, the similarity of its style to that of *The Purple Island*. The evidence

which Mr Boas, like Grosart, adduces for definitely assigning the poem to Fletcher is all internal, but it is sufficient. 'Between *Britain's Ida*' Mr Boas writes, 'and a number of Phineas Fletcher's avowed poems there is an intricate series of correspondences, which are different in kind from ordinary cases of parallel or imitation, and which can only be explained by his authorship of *Britain's Ida*.'

In his observations on the 'piscatory' play, *Sicelides*, Mr Boas raises an interesting point. On the strength of certain entries found under the year 1607 in the Account Books of King's College, he hazards the opinion that *Sicelides* was not the sole contribution of Fletcher to the academic drama. The entries refer to an 'Englishe Comodye' performed at King's in 1607, and one of them definitely cites Fletcher's name as its author. Mr Boas thinks it highly improbable that this 'comodye' could have been *Sicelides*, but that it must have been 'one of those numerous products of the academic stage concerning which College Bursars in the faithful discharge of their office have recorded every item involved in their production, but with lofty detachment have not even mentioned their name.'

The editor's task with the works of Giles Fletcher was, naturally, much lighter than with those of Phineas. It should, however, be noted that he reprints for the first time since their appearance in 1611 two elegies, one in Latin and the other in English, on Henry, Prince of Wales. They will not add much to the poet's reputation. This new edition, however, of all the known works of the two poet brothers will, we feel sure, greatly add to the interest taken in their poetry, and so justify the editor's hope that his book will 'lay the foundation of a more critical and considered estimate of their poetic merits than has hitherto been possible.'

W. Lewis Jones.

Bangor.

*Über Thomas Heywoods The Life and Death of Hector, eine Neubearbeitung von Lydgates Troy Book.* Von Franz Albert. (Münchener Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie. Heft xlii.) Leipzig: Georg Böhme. 1909. 8vo. 185 pp.

Dr Albert here deals with a rather curious literary phenomenon. In 1614 Thomas Purfoot printed a poem in 5 books called 'The Life and Death of Hector, one and the first of...the Nyne worthies...Written by John Lidgate Monke of Berry, and by him dedicated to...Henry the fift, King of England.' Though said to be written by Lydgate, and carrying no other indication of authorship, the poem, in which six-lined stanzas (*a b a b c c*) take the place of Lydgate's couplets, is clearly a new version of Lydgate's *Troy Book* by a modern hand. Who was this person, and how closely in subject-matter and style does his work agree with Lydgate's? Where it has passages or expressions not to be found in the *Troy Book*, from what source do they come, and with

what motive are they inserted? Such are the questions which Dr Albert sets himself to answer, and his treatment of them shows the characteristic, here and there meticulous, thoroughness of German method. It is not necessary to restate Dr Albert's results. Sufficient to say that a comparison of *The Life and Death of Hector* with Thomas Heywood's epical poem *Troia Britannica* and his dramas *The Brazen Age* and *The Iron Age*, leads him to the conclusion that the first work like the others is to be certainly ascribed to Heywood. In coming to this conclusion Dr Albert is not upsetting, but justifying, what has been a common opinion since the days of Dr Farmer, who wrote in a note quoted by Allibone, 'This modern versification...is generally attributed to T. Heywood,' though, he added, Fuller and other writers had mistaken it for Lydgate's own. The attribution to Heywood was repeated by Lowndes and others, but it was left to Dr Albert to find solid grounds for what had been merely a plausible suggestion.

Dr Albert further shows that Heywood's poem was based on the edition of the *Troy Book* printed by Thomas Marshe in 1555. The likeness of the two works in subject-matter and treatment is so close—Heywood uses the first person where Lydgate does so and speaks of Chaucer as his master—that one is not surprised that G. Ellis in his *Specimens of the Early English Poets* (1803) characterised *The Life and Death of Hector* as 'this strange instance of perverted talents and industry.' It can only have sprung from a very enthusiastic admiration of Lydgate on the part of the seventeenth-century dramatist. But that in itself is an interesting fact in literary history which was well worth proving. Dr Albert (pp. 25, 26) reproaches his author with allowing inflexional endings like -ing, -less, -ness, -ly, -est, -ed, to stand in a stressed position in the line. But the occurrence of weak stresses in the place of strong, even in the rime-syllable, is seen on every page of Shakespeare and is a means of giving a pleasing variety to English verse. There is therefore nothing worth remarking in 'coúragès (Albert accents 'cóuragés') most stout.' A frequent use of forms like 'travellèd,' where the colloquial speech of the time would have 'travel'd' may be a sign of weakness; but it is not to be condemned on purely metrical grounds. Shakespeare rimes 'married': 'bed,' 'remedies': 'lies,' 'lies: qualities,' 'predominant': 'plant,'—all in a few pages of *Romeo and Juliet*.

Dr Albert (p. 26) prints 'Át your hánds to whóm with gríef and páin' and considers it a case of 'fehlende Auftakt.' But 'your' is dissyllabic. When Heywood speaks of 'the proverbe that blood with blood always reveng'd will be,' he is not thinking of 'An eye for an eye etc.' as Dr Albert says (p. 113): cp. *Macbeth* III, 4. 122.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

*The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars*, 1597—1603. By Charles William Wallace. Reprinted from University Studies of the University of Nebraska. 1908. 8vo. xvi + 207 pp.

Dr Wallace has for some years been engaged in systematic research at the Record Office and elsewhere, and claims to have tracked much unpublished material which will throw new light upon the history of the Jacobean stage as a whole, and upon that of the succession of companies of boy-actors, known generically as the Revels Companies, in particular. A foretaste of his results has already been given by means of certain communications to the daily journals, of which the latest, dealing with the location of the Globe Theatre, has aroused controversy. But for an analysis and valuation of Dr Wallace's new facts the time is not yet. That will come when they have been published in full, and with sufficient and exact references. The present book, which is of an introductory nature, does not call them greatly in aid. Some commissions to various Masters of the Children of the Chapel are printed for the first time, and there are some quotations from the records of law-suits between Henry Evans and Edward Kirkham, supplementary to those printed by Mr Greenstreet, and from a few other documents known to Dr Wallace, the full texts of which are not yet given. In the main, however, the writer is here assembling and drawing conclusions from material already familiar, and therefore comes up for judgment as a literary historian rather than as a researcher. His assembling is done exhaustively, and on the whole with commendable, although not perfect, accuracy. I venture to think that his conclusions are in certain respects vitiated by an exaggerated conception of the extent to which it is possible to get behind the often conventional phraseology of official documents, and to reconstruct not merely what was said and done by sixteenth and seventeenth century Queens and Privy Councils and accounting officers, but also the underlying and personal motives which led them to say and do it. Like Lear, Dr Wallace will talk of court news and take upon him the mystery of things, as if he were God's spy. There are interesting and valuable side issues in *The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars*, such as a study of the fabric of the Blackfriars and another of the Jacobean custom of sitting on the stage; but the *clou* of the book is certainly an attempt to expound—and to show that earlier historians of the stage have failed to penetrate—a theory of the personal relations of Elizabeth to the Children of the Chapel, which, to speak quite frankly, I cannot bring myself to regard, for all the learning and ingenuity with which it is supported, as resting upon any solid foundation.

The following passage fairly represents Dr Wallace's thesis:

> Elizabeth, always a patron and lover of the drama, had some definite notion of what the theatre should be. Not the completeness nor the incompleteness with which her notion was executed by officials, but her purpose therein is the point of main concern in this consideration. Upon the numerous public theatres, particularly those of second-rate sort, the Queen looked with no more favor than did the City.

The Lord Mayor and aldermen attempted reformation by driving the theatres out. The Queen attempted reformation by fostering meritorious exclusiveness. Her declared purpose was to reform abuses and increase the usefulness of the stage. In carrying out her notion the Queen established a restrictive law on strolling players. She established the Blackfriars, which, whether so intended or not, became at once the envy and the model of the time. She fostered the privacy of Paul's. She attempted to suppress the less worthy of the public theatres, and to put the Globe and Fortune on the basis of exclusiveness their companies merited (p. 150).

Having once arrived at an intuition as to Elizabeth's personal attitude towards the stage, it is of course not particularly difficult to read the evidence in the light of it. But that evidence is in itself colourless, and at least equally consistent with the view that Elizabeth's personal interest in the matter was limited to the ordering of a sufficient number of amusing plays on sufficiently economical terms for her 'solace' at Christmas, and that, so long as this was secured, she was quite willing to leave the Privy Council and the City Corporation to arrange the control and 'reform' of the London theatres between them. As the Children of the Chapel were part of her household establishment, it is perhaps reasonable to suppose that her sanction was required before they could begin to perform in public; but it is a long step from this to the conclusion that their plays were set up on her initiative, as a move in a deliberate dramatic policy, and even, as Dr Wallace thinks, at her expense. It is difficult, without injustice, to condense Dr Wallace's arguments into a brief statement; but, roughly, these are the grounds on which he bases his theory: (*a*) A Star-Chamber complaint in 1601 against an abuse of the Master of the Children's commission to 'take up' boys for the royal service led to a censure of the principal offender, but did not interfere with the continuance of the performances, and statements attributed by the complainant to the managers of the theatre 'show a confident security in the Queen's grants and permissions.' (*b*) Elizabeth occasionally attended plays at the Blackfriars, and is not known to have visited any other theatre. (*c*) Edward Kirkham, the Yeoman of the Revels, was interested in the 'dietting and ordering' of the boys. He had the custody of the Queen's theatrical apparel, and 'charge over expenditures in the "setting out" of plays at court' and it was 'through him, from some account yet to be discovered,' that Elizabeth provided the necessary expenditure upon the Blackfriars. (*d*) Frederic Gerschow, who visited London with Philip Julius, Duke of Stettin, in 1602, saw a performance, and wrote in his diary that the Queen had established the theatre and provided it with costumes ('die Königin ein sonderlich Theatrum erbauet und mit köstlichen Kleidern zum Überfluss versorget hat'). (*e*) The strict Privy Council orders passed from 1597 to 1603, with the object of limiting the number of public theatres to two, and their performances to two a week, cannot be ascribed to the Puritan views of the City, for the Council had to complain that the City had failed to carry them out; and must therefore have been conceived by the Queen in the interests of the Blackfriars. It was their knowledge of Elizabeth's differentiation against them which led the Globe players to lend their services to the

Essex conspiracy, and 'never after did good feeling exist on either side.' No plays were given at court during the Christmas of 1601–2, and it is difficult to repress the suggestion that this was due to the Queen's displeasure with the public theatres.

On each of these points my comments can be equally brief. (*a*) The Master of the Children may very likely, like other servants of the royal household, have presumed a good deal upon the privileges given by his commission; but in fact the offender received a punishment from the Star Chamber fully commensurate with his offence. No special intervention of Elizabeth to shield the managers of the company is shown. (*b*) The idea that Elizabeth visited the Blackfriars is based upon a letter of Dudley Carleton already quoted by me in *The Modern Language Review* for October, 1906. The play in question took place after a dinner at Lord Hunsdon's, who lived in the Blackfriars, and presumably gave the performance at his own house. A record of a precisely similar performance at Hunsdon's house by his own company, after a dinner to an ambassador, will be found in the *Sidney Papers*, ii, 175. (*c*) The voluminous accounts of the Revels Office show that the Yeoman had no responsibility for expenditure upon the setting out of plays at court, except in conjunction with the Master and other superior officers; and if Kirkham was an accountant for royal funds in any other capacity, it would almost certainly be possible to produce one of his accounts or some warrant for a payment made to him. Dr Wallace's hypothesis must be regarded as untenable, unless and until he can do this. (*d*) It is impossible to rest much upon the very general statements of a foreign traveller, who would naturally regard the Children of the Chapel Royal as 'established' by the Queen, as indeed they were, in a sense, since the singing boys, for whose maintenance she paid £40 a year, formed their nucleus. If the words proved that she maintained the company, they would also prove that she provided the building, whereas we happen to know that the managers rented it from the Burbages. And in fact there can be little doubt that the expenses of the theatre were met out of the profits of the public performances. The whole existence of plays in London depended on Elizabeth's economical desire to have companies for court entertainments without paying for their upkeep. (*e*) There was no doubt a rivalry during the closing years of Elizabeth's reign between the adult and the boy actors; but there is no indication whatever that Elizabeth in any way threw the weight of her personal influence against the men. The statement that there were no court plays during the Christmas of 1601–2 is incorrect. There were nine, two by the Chapel boys, and seven by three companies of men. Of these, four fell to the lot of the Chamberlain's men, who are supposed by Dr Wallace to have been then enjoying the Queen's special disfavour. Perhaps on this also I may be allowed to refer to my article of October 1906 cited above. Finally, it is to be observed that there are two occasions upon record on which Elizabeth did take personal action in favour of particular companies, and that both of these were adult companies. Her

wish to see Edward Alleyn back upon the stage was given by the Privy Council in 1600 as a special reason for licensing his venture of the Fortune (*Henslowe Papers*, 51). And it was 'upon notice of her Ma$^{ties}$: pleasure at the suit of the Earle of Oxford' that toleration was given in 1602 to a new company formed by the amalgamation of Worcester's and Oxford's men (*Malone Society Collections*, i, 86).

E. K. Chambers.

Gerrard's Cross.

*A History of English Prosody from the Twelfth Century to the Present Day.* By George Saintsbury. Vol. II. From Shakespeare to Crabbe. London: Macmillan & Co. 1908. 8vo. xvi + 583 pp.

Professor Saintsbury is to be congratulated upon the second volume of his *History of English Prosody*. It is not only a valuable contribution to the subject, but also a thoroughly readable book; and to write a readable book about prosody is no small feat. In fact it is much more than a history of prosody: it is almost a history of English poetry. Many other things are dealt with besides the qualities of the verse; and the examples are so chosen in some of the chapters, as to furnish a poetical anthology which is very interesting and delightful. Certain thorny questions about the essential character of English metre, which were necessarily suggested by the first volume, are deliberately postponed till the third, and we can be content to enjoy the repast which is provided for us here, without troubling ourselves much about first principles. We feel sure that the author, who is nothing if not combative, would not desire to find us entirely in agreement with his opinions; and whatever differences of opinion the reviewer may feel called upon to express, he cannot fail to admire the catholic appreciation of good poetry of all kinds which Professor Saintsbury shows in this book, and the vigorous manner in which he champions the causes in which he is interested.

The period with which this volume is concerned extends from the latter years of the sixteenth century to near the end of the eighteenth, and includes an immense variety of poetical production,—the drama including Shakespeare, the Elizabethan sonnet and lyric, the Caroline lyric, Milton, Cowley, Dryden, Pope, Thomson, Collins, Gray, Goldsmith—these headings give some idea of the extent of ground which is traversed and the various prosodic forms of which the history is traced,—blank verse, dramatic and other, lyric stanzas of the most varied kind, and the couplet, both short and long, in every stage of its development from Marlowe to Crabbe. The weakest part of the book is the treatment of the drama, and the chapter on Milton is to a great extent spoilt by the disproportionate amount of space given to the discussion of one particular subject, not of the first importance. On the seventeenth century lyric Professor Saintsbury is perhaps seen at his best, and the chapter on Dryden also is excellent. This volume

generally is rather less pervaded than the preceding one with the author's characteristic oddities of phrase and allusion, but they make themselves felt sometimes in an irritating manner. The controversial tone is still too apparent, but it is interesting to note the efforts which have evidently been made to do justice to opponents, however wrong-headed. Professor Saintsbury evidently regards his own impartiality as almost miraculous, and he speaks on one occasion of the 'transparent and Golden-Age-like equity' that reigns in this book. Certainly there seems to be some improvement here upon the former volume.

In the first chapter, headed 'Shakespeare and Blank Verse,' Marlowe receives a rather grudging appreciation. It is true of course that even in his finest work the 'single-moulded line' predominates, but this is not the most important thing to be noted. The really vital matter is the fact that he is working himself free from this limitation, and that in this respect blank verse owes to him a great and fruitful development. Professor Saintsbury acknowledges the prosodic merit of such passages as that in *Tamburlaine*, 'If all the pens that ever poets held,' etc., but complains rather strangely that even here the lines are separable and that the passage is not closely enough welded together. In fact, however, it is in Marlowe's work, and not in *Titus Andronicus* (which Professor Saintsbury holds to be undoubtedly Shakespearian), that we find the beginnings of the dramatic blank verse paragraph, of which Marlowe was more than anyone else the inventor.

> Ah, Spencer, not the riches of my realm
> Can ransom him! ah, he is marked to die!
> I know the malice of the younger Mortimer,
> Warwick I know is rough, and Lancaster
> Inexorable, and I shall never see
> My lovely Pierce of Gaveston again.

Passages like this, whether the lines have stops at the end or no, are not composed of single-moulded lines, everything is subordinate to the general balance of the paragraph; and what a master of the verse paragraph Marlowe became is evident enough in *Hero and Leander*, in spite of the couplet rhyme, e.g.,

> Nor that night-wandering, pale and watery star,
> (When yawning dragons draw her thirling car
> From Latmus' mount up to the gloomy sky,
> Where, crowned with blazing light and majesty,
> She proudly sits) more over-rules the flood,
> Than she the hearts of those that near her stood.

Shakespeare needed no better models for the verse paragraph than those which he found in Marlowe; and the idea that before he could attain to complete freedom in running on from line to line he had to go through a special course of couplets (p. 21), strikes us as nothing short of fantastic.

With reference to the treatment of Shakespeare, it must be remarked at once that Professor Saintsbury's ventures in the higher

criticism are for the most part very hazardous. Conjectures are freely thrown out with regard to the chronological sequence or internal development of the plays, which appear to rest upon the very slightest grounds. It is suggested with confidence that *The Merchant of Venice*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (apparently) and *Measure for Measure* all contain work of several different periods, while the practical certainty that *Love's Labour's Lost* was to some extent rewritten is entirely ignored, though the passages here quoted as illustrating very early work are from a rewritten scene, and perhaps not earlier than 1598. We are invited to consider *Troilus and Cressida* as 'in part at least' an early work, and to place *Coriolanus* in order of time before *Julius Cæsar*. Few will be found to agree that *Lucrece* looks like earlier work than *Venus and Adonis*, either prosodically or otherwise, and the metrical argument used in support of this position (p. 59), if we rightly understand what is meant by 'tetremimeral caesura,' is no more justified by the facts than the reference in this connection to Gascoigne. Professor Saintsbury is afraid that the reader will be puzzled by the arrangement which he adopts of Shakespeare's plays, and it is certainly difficult to see what advantages it has. He treats first of the plays mentioned by Meres as existing in 1598, identifying *All's Well that Ends Well* with 'Love labours wonne' (which by a slip he calls 'Love's Labour's Found'), and then, as if the authority of Meres were the only trustworthy evidence which we possessed, he gives up all attempt at chronology, and adopts, with some slight variations, the order of the first folio. But we are just as much assured by external evidence that *Much Ado* and *As You Like It* existed in 1600, *Twelfth Night* in 1601, and *Hamlet* in 1604, as that *The Merchant of Venice* existed in 1598, and as for the asserted impossibility of constructing an approximate chronological order on metrical grounds, the author has himself put such an argument out of court by basing upon these grounds the conjectures of which we have spoken.

In spite of these vagaries the qualities of Shakespeare's blank verse are fairly appreciated; but the chapters on his contemporaries and followers in the drama are singularly insufficient. The author's remarks upon their prosodic style are for the most part superficial, and are left almost entirely without the illustration of examples. It is impossible, from the account given, to form any proper conception of the metrical characteristics of Marston, Dekker, Webster, Heywood or Tourneur; each is dismissed with a few phrases, which mean something or nothing, and such matters of prosodic interest as the curious metrical difference between *The Atheist's Tragedy* and *The Revenger's Tragedy* are passed over entirely without mention. The difference in metrical style between Beaumont and Fletcher is as clearly marked as it well can be, but Professor Saintsbury has not chosen to distinguish their characteristics; nor does he appear to take any real interest in Massinger, or to have any adequate notion of his metrical quality. Very much more space is given both to Shirley and to Davenant.

In marked contrast with this unsatisfactory work is the chapter

on 'Spenser's Fellows and Followers,' which is admirable in appreciation and discrimination; and almost as much may be said of the next, on the Elizabethan Lyric and Sonnet, including Donne, though the prosodic merits of Donne are considerably exaggerated.

The chapter on Milton is almost ruined by the author's obsession on the subject of trisyllabic feet. Professor Saintsbury seems to think that the world abounds with people who deny trisyllabic feet to Milton, and are altogether wrongheaded about apostrophation and elision; and his insistence on the obvious in this matter becomes tiresome. It is a subject which might have been disposed of quite easily in a very short space, but 'this peculiar and probably irreconcilable debate' is actually allowed to occupy, with a few digressions, nearly thirty pages, while the really important matters about Milton's epic blank verse, the variety of pause, the structure of the verse paragraph, and the choice of metrically effective words and phrases, are dismissed with disappointing brevity. Moreover this chapter is disfigured by a most unfortunate series of mistakes in quotation. In the citation on p. 211 of two stanzas from the Nativity Ode, there are no fewer than four inaccuracies, a full stop for a comma at the end of l. 2, 'Edgèd' for Edg'd in l. 5, 'still' for 'chill' and 'forsakes' for 'forgoes' in the two last lines. On p. 213 we have 'eyes of coal' for 'eyne of coal,' p. 218 'Lawes sonnet' for 'Lawrence sonnet,' p. 228 'Is not' for 'Is now,' p. 232 'unfraught' for 'o'refraught' (two most serious misprints). Add to these several in an earlier quotation from Donne, p. 159 f., 'wearied' for 'wean'd,' 'those' for 'there,' 'more' for 'moe,' the rhyme being twice destroyed in a passage of nine lines. The review of Milton's early lyric style and of the verse of *Comus* is on the whole adequate; but why is there such a grudging acknowledgement of the excellence of the sonnets? Professor Saintsbury actually regrets that Milton reverted to the Italian form, though he admits that it is the more suitable for his subjects. Surely it is very unnecessary to desire that the English language should possess only one of the two established sonnet forms, considering what splendid work has been achieved with each, and it is difficult to think that Professor Saintsbury would really desire to be without such masterly examples of the 'turn' as we have in the sonnets 'How soon hath time,' 'When I consider,' 'Cromwell, our chief of men,' 'Daughter to that good earl,' especially as its position is not stiffly confined to the end of the octett, but frequently varied so as to break the line.

The attempt to establish the existence of alexandrines in Milton's blank verse can hardly be said to have succeeded: the examples cited can better be explained as instances of trisyllabic redundance. Such are *Comus*, 192, 'Is now the labour of my thoughts, 'tis likeliest,' 732, 'The sea o'refraught would swell, and th' unsought diamonds,' *Par. Lost*, viii, 216, and ix, 249, ending with 'satiety' and 'society' respectively, *Par. Reg.*, i, 302, 'society,' iv, 173 (a dissyllabic ending), *Sams. Agon.*, 797, 868. The irregularity in *Comus*, 617, seems to be due to the break in the line. Another thing that tends to shake the reader's confidence in the judgment of the author is the extent to

which he quotes irrelevant examples to support his arguments. For example, in reference to the well-known line 'Burnt after them to the bottomless pit,' it is idle to quote such perfectly normal instances of reversed rhythm as *Par. Reg.*, iii, 392, 'Of enemies, of aids, battles and leagues,' or iv, 639, 'Home to his mother's house private return'd.' The difficulty lies in the fact that reversed rhythm (when not initial) is normally preceded by a syllable capable of emphasis, and usually by a pause either slight or decided. These conditions are fulfilled in *P. R.*, iii, 392, and iv, 639, but not in the line in question, nor in *P. R.*, i, 361, iv, 289 (which are properly quoted in illustration) where 'to the,' 'from the,' are the words preceding the inversion. Examples of the normal rhythm are *P. R.*, i, 169, 197, 228, 332, 347, 377, 482, 495. Of the trisyllabic feet controversy, which is largely a question of words and terms, we will say nothing here, except in the first place that the eagerness of the author to prove his case with regard to *Paradise Lost* has caused the considerable difference in this matter between *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* to be passed over almost without notice, and secondly that we do not admire Professor Saintsbury's controversial tone in this discussion. To speak of a line of Milton as 'a famous Guest-choker' (p. 249) is hardly a decent form of reference to a distinguished scholar, and 'the inextinguishable wrath of the excellent Master of Sidney' (so the author calls him) refers merely to the fact that Dr Guest objects to the division of the compound 'wide-encroaching' between two lines, a point on which most of us would probably agree with him rather than with Professor Saintsbury.

Professor Saintsbury's dealings with Waller leave us in some doubt whether he properly appreciates his position as regards the heroic couplet. The lines which he quotes on p. 281 are not really characteristic of the new movement, and the qualities which were specially admired in Waller's verse by the succeeding generation are rather conspicuously absent. It was not that he had no reversed rhythm—he had it in fact plentifully of course at the beginning of the line, and pretty often elsewhere[1], nor that he had no trisyllabic feet,—for why should such words as 'Albion,' 'conquering,' 'list'ning,' 'powerful,' be counted as having three syllables in Milton and only two in Waller? The actual reform which is to be ascribed to Waller consists in the *balance* which he gives to his words and clauses, so as to fit them precisely to the metrical conditions of the couplet. Such lines as those quoted by Professor Saintsbury as characteristic,

> With the sweet sound of this harmonious lay
> About the keel delighted dolphins play, etc.

[1] For example, in the lines to Falkland :

> l. 13. That know thy worth, and know how prodigal
> Of thy great soul thou art, longing to twist
> Bay with that ivy, etc.
> l. 21. Some happy wind over the Ocean blow.

So also in ll. 26, 38, and in the *Instructions to a Painter*, ll. 10, 69, 75, 116, 130, etc.

have advanced no further in this path than to have their clauses measured by the line, with a slight pause at the end of the first, and a more marked one at the end of the second, of the couplet. But if we take such a piece of verse as the lines *At Penshurst*, we find qualities of a very different and much more complex kind, an elaborate system of balance and antithesis of words, clauses, lines, and couplets, so devised as to give the measure its fullest effectiveness:

> While in the park I sing, the list'ning deer
> Attend my passion, and forget to fear;
> When to the beeches I report my flame,
> They bow their heads, as if they felt the same; etc.

and this is what was so much admired and imitated, not a mere external smoothness of rhythm. What Professor Saintsbury looks upon as added graces are in fact the essential features of the style.

The Caroline lyric and Pindaric are dealt with satisfactorily, but Herrick suffers from want of illustrative quotation. Perhaps the author thinks that everyone knows his best pieces by heart. With regard to Dryden a few slight criticisms only are needed. Professor Saintsbury very properly gives much attention to those lyrics which, being buried in the plays, have often almost escaped notice; but though interested in triple measures, he has singularly failed to distinguish between dactylic and anapæstic metre. The difference is essentially the same as that between trochaic and iambic. The metre of 'From the low palace of old Father Ocean' (p. 373) and 'Long between love and fear Phyllis tormented' (p. 377) is dactylic, while that of 'While Alexis lay pressed' is anapæstic; and it is surely worth while in a book on prosody to mark the distinction. The statement that 'numerous examples of the fourteener' occur in Dryden's Virgil (p. 383) is decidedly misleading. This line is used repeatedly with a view to a special effect in the translation of the fourth Eclogue, e.g. ll. 15, 63, 73, 75, but, so far as I know, only twice in the whole of the other works, viz. Æn. iv, 271 'Things done relates; not done she feigns; and mingles truth with lies'; and vi, 1209 (where it is probably the result of inadvertence). The development of metrical suppression in Dryden's work should have been more carefully traced. In the earlier period the full pronunciation to 'the' or 'to' before vowels, and also of the final '-ed,' is quite common, e.g., *Astr. Red.*, 42, 70, 147, *Ann. Mir.*, 81. 2, 92. 3, 93. 4, 94. 2, 101. 2; while in the first part of *Absalom and Achitophel* there is perhaps only a single instance, l. 239, and in the later work hardly any. This furnishes an important indication of the change that was proceeding.

On the eighteenth century the author is rather too brief. Justice is done to Pope, Prior and Thomson, but hardly to Collins, Gray or Goldsmith. Of Collins he speaks indeed with some enthusiasm, but he devotes to him little more than two pages, and less than two pages to Gray, which, in a volume of five hundred and seventy-six pages dealing with the prosody of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, is an absurdly small amount. Goldsmith fares even worse, and little

or no appreciation is shown of the difference between his couplet and Johnson's.

The peculiarities of Professor Saintsbury's style are familiar to us all; and though this volume is more soberly written than some of his books, yet it has no lack of characteristic features. In many cases these are to be regretted, being either tasteless quibbles, e.g. (p. 408) 'Pope himself can scarcely give him points (or rather can give him nothing but point),' (p. 573) 'No doubt these feet were sometimes not beautiful on any mountain'; inappropriate allusions or quotations, as (p. 215) 'a *castiliano* which is too likely to become *vulgo*,' (p. 226) 'may well release his captor from all damages *de raptu suo*,' (p. 562) 'You can "intabesce" in *both* directions here, unfortunately'; unnecessary introduction of foreign words, 'this *hervorragend* eminence,' 'you can *escamoter* the accent'; or mere eccentricities of word or phrase, of which it is not worth while to accumulate examples. Of the quotations which, instead of elucidating the subject, merely distract the mind from it, some of the most objectionable are those that drag in irrelevant questions of textual criticism or interpretation, as (p. 528) 'a very base or a very foolish Judean,' (p. 559) 'to embrace one "substance of a doubt" as noble, and refuse to allow any dram of eale to do it to that dram's nature.' But Professor Saintsbury has the qualities of his defects. Occasionally in his endeavour to arrest the attention of his readers he hits upon phrases which brilliantly illuminate instead of obscuring the point at issue, e.g. (p. 7) 'to turn it from a string of dazzling beads to a ringed and winged serpent of colour and fire'; or introduces a really felicitous quotation, as (p. 234) 'That marvellous billowy flow of verse...with an occasional break or ripple, but mostly "too full for noise or foam"' (though he has spoilt even this by substituting 'noise' for 'sound'). For the sake of these successes we must be content to put up with a certain number of rather irritating failures.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

*The Poetical Works of John Dryden.* Edited by George R. Noyes. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1908. 8vo. xlii + 1054 pp.

The new edition of Dryden which comes to us from California is a most admirable contribution to the series of 'The Cambridge Poets.' We have here in a single volume the whole of Dryden's poetical work, both original and translated, with the exception of the dramas, and of these last the prologues, epilogues, and songs are included. No popular edition, so far as we know, has hitherto included the translations from Greek and Latin, which form such an important part of Dryden's work, and which occupy in this volume about four hundred pages. In connection with these we have also the prefaces and dedications which

belong to them, including the *Discourse concerning Satire* and the *Dedication of the Æneis*, so that altogether about half of Dryden's critical essays appear in this volume. The works are arranged in chronological order, with full accounts of the form in which they appeared; and the texts have been most carefully collated with the early editions. The editor justly observes that the chronological arrangement 'should give the reader a clearer conception of Dryden's literary development, and of his relation to the politics of his time, than the classified arrangement hitherto followed.' The volume is made more complete and interesting by the addition in appendix of poems and translations which have been attributed to Dryden, or in which he may have had a hand, as the *Essay upon Satire*, for which he was assaulted in Rose Alley, and a translation of Boileau's *Art Poétique*, which he probably revised.

There is an excellent portrait, a well-written biography, and a sufficient supply of notes, which for the most part are satisfactory. Sometimes, however, an explanation is adopted from Scott without sufficient consideration; as in the note on *Annus Mirabilis*, stanza cci. Here there is certainly no reference to Henry III: the meaning is that the cause of the English was so just, that Henry IV, the first Bourbon, would in this instance refuse to side with his descendant, who was their enemy. Again in *Absalom and Achitophel*, l. 196, the true interpretation is probably that of Churton Collins, that David would have composed one of his psalms in honour of Achitophel, and so Heaven would have been deprived of at least one song of praise.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

*The Romantic Movement in English Poetry.* By Arthur Symons. London: Constable. 1909. 8vo. 344 pp.

A book coming from Mr Arthur Symons could scarcely be other than good, but this particular volume excels anticipation and must certainly be ranked as among the best gifts of recent criticism.

The scheme of the book is somewhat peculiar. Mr Symons has neither tried to develop the history of the Romantic Movement in a regular sequence, nor attempted to trace to their sources the different tendencies expressing themselves at that epoch: he has simply taken individual authors as they were, without any attempt to classify or connect them. In a very interesting and able introduction he defends his method, or rather his lack of method: he asserts that the modern endeavour to find a vital relation between the poet and his age is essentially wrong; there is no such relation:

> It is the poet who, by his genius, makes the taste of the time All that 'conflicts of tendencies' and the like have to do with the poet is to help him now and again to a convenient form....No great poet ever owed any essential part of his genius to his age; at the most he may have owed to his age the opportunity of an easy achievement.

Surely Mr Symons is a little too hasty. If genius means only sheer ability, pure capacity of mind and nothing else, then it is obvious that a poet does not and cannot owe any essential part of it to his own age. But, if genius means not only capacity, but also inspiration, then surely a poet may owe to his time a very essential part indeed.

The examples which Mr Symons himself cites to prove his point—Chatterton and Pope—seem to cut both ways. Chatterton was certainly not inspired by his age, but it is quite open to anyone to say that he perished because he found it so uncongenial; while, as for Pope, is it so certain that he was no poet, nothing but 'a writer of extraordinary pure capacity?' Are there not passionate lines in the *Eloisa*, and beautiful descriptions in the *Iliad*, which seem to suggest that in another age Pope might have been a truly powerful love poet or a really fine nature poet? Is it not possible that the ability was there and only the inspiration wanting? These are Mr Symons' own examples, and if we turn to other writers, the theory is still more doubtful. There is Spenser. As *Mother Hubberd's Tale* shows he might have been Pope's equal in scathing satire, but he chose to write the *Faerie Queene* instead. Had his age nothing to do with that choice? Or again, there is Dryden. Had he not the true 'heroic stuff' in him and was he not denied his full genius because his age gave him no inspiration? Does he not suggest a marred Elizabethan, spoilt because astray in a meaner time?

It is not necessary, however, to argue at length on Mr Symons theory. It is enough to say that, since he recognises no necessary connection between the poet and his age, each writer is for him a detached entity, standing quite apart from the rest, and the book thus resolves itself into a series of essays, varying in length from a paragraph to a number of pages, according to the value of the writer discussed. This want of connection makes the book appear somewhat disjointed; but there can be no doubt as to the value of the individual judgments, or of the catholic sympathies and wide range of taste which they reveal. Mr Symons also expresses his thought with a fineness of illustration that seems to give the substance double value. Take, for example, this phrase from the Introduction:

> It was Dionysus that awoke in Burns, and has never been out of the blood of any authentic poet since. Burns is neither eighteenth nor nineteenth century, neither local nor temporary, but the very flame of man, speaking as a man has only spoken once or twice in the world. He taught no one anything that anyone could learn, but this ploughman was Apollo to Admetus, incarnate song.

The poets of the Romantic Movement, as Mr Symons views them, have only one thing really in common, that they bring 'the emancipation of the world and of the mind and of the vehicle of poetry from the bondage of fact, opinion, formality and tradition; and when fact, opinion, formality and tradition go out, imagination comes in.' This emancipation took different forms in the leading poets of the period, but in some way or other it is evidenced in all.

As we should expect, one of the best essays is that on Blake. Mr Symons explains, and no one ever explained better, the unique quality of Blake's poetry:

> The voice of desire is not in it, nor the voice of passion, nor the cry of the heart, nor the cry of the sinner to God, nor of the lover of nature to nature....It is like the voice of wisdom in a child, who has not yet forgotten the world out of which the soul came. It is as spontaneous as the note of a bird ;...it is lyric thought.

Mr Symons notes subtly the difference between Wordsworth's nature poetry and Blake's. Blake esteemed even Wordsworth too much of a realist; to Blake nothing in nature exists in and for itself alone; everything is a type of some deeper reality; therefore to Blake nothing is trivial:

> Thus he writes of the lamb and the tiger, of the joy and sorrow of infants, of the fly and the lily, as no poet of mere observation has ever written of them, going deeper into their essence than Wordsworth ever went into the heart of daffodils, or Shelley into the nerves of the sensitive plant.

There is less that is original in the essay on Wordsworth. Mr Symons agrees with Matthew Arnold in his general view of the poet as a writer absolutely simple, straightforward and sincere, so that, when he is at his best, nature seems to take the pen from him and write; and he agrees that Wordsworth's chief faults are his inequality and his occasional childishness. There are one or two especially felicitous observations such as the remark that Wordsworth had 'a Quaker wisdom and waited on the silent voices in "a wise passiveness" with that "happy stillness of the mind" in which truth may be received unsought.'

The essay on Coleridge is as subtle and as interesting as that on Blake though it perhaps charms less. Mr Symons does not take the common view of Coleridge as a poet whose capacity was largely spoilt by his absorption in philosophy; on the contrary he points out that both the poetry and the philosophy spring from the same root:

> The poet and the philosopher are but two aspects of one reality ; or, rather, the poetic and the philosophic attitudes are but two ways of seeing. The poet who is not also a philosopher is like a flower without a root....Poetry and metaphysics are alike a disengaging, for different ends, of the absolute element in things.

He justly points out that Coleridge's weakness as a philosopher is identical with his weakness as a poet! both result in a want of energy, the lack of a vitality sufficient to balance his intellect:

> To Coleridge there was as much difficulty in belief as in action, for belief is itself an action of the mind. He was always anxious to believe anything that would carry him beyond the limits of time and space, but it was not often that he could give more than a speculative assent to even the most improbable of creeds. Always seeking fixity, his mind was too fluid for any anchor to hold in it. He drifted from speculation to speculation, often seeming to forget his aim by the way, in almost the collector's delight over the curiosities he had found in passing.

It is the same want of fixity that prevents his settling down to poetry; he has no sooner conceived his ideas than he doubts their value, and it is only when Wordsworth is at hand to reassure him that

he really achieves anything, because his friend gives him the confidence which was lacking in himself:

> Had Coleridge been able to live uninterruptedly in the company of the Wordsworths, even with the unsympathetic wife at home, the opium in the cupboard, and the *magnum opus* on the desk, I am convinced that we should have had for our reading to-day all those poems which went down with him into silence.

Mr Symons points out that the sub-conscious element plays a larger part in the poetry of Coleridge than in that of any other poet; his poems never seem to come by any intellectual process, neither by deliberate composition nor by conscious reflection; they do not arise from the waking consciousness as such, but seem to float from the background of the mind; his poems have always an affinity with the dream world, and some of the best are dreams pure and simple, such as *Kubla Khan,* of which Mr Symons says:

> It has just enough meaning to give it bodily existence; otherwise it would be disembodied music. It seems to hover in the air, like one of the island enchantments of Prospero. It is music not made with hands, and the words seem, as they literally were, remembered.

It is the same element, as of a dream fully and completely accepted, which creates the charm of *The Ancient Mariner.* Coleridge can make us suspend our disbelief so willingly because to him the whole thing is real. He does not take it, of course, for the same kind of reality as that of the outer world; it belongs to a different sphere with different laws; but it has its own logic, and it is quite certainly existent: to Coleridge whatever affected his mind was real:

> It is full of simple, daily emotion, transported, by an awful power of sight, to which the limits of reality are no barrier, into an unknown sea and air; it is realised throughout the whole of its ghastly and marvellous happenings; and there is in the narrative an ease, a buoyancy almost, which I can only compare with the music of Mozart, extracting its sweetness from the stuff of tragedy.

Mr Symons calls attention also to the peculiar love of colour which characterises all Coleridge's work, and to his intense delight in music.

The chapter on Byron is full of admirable things: Byron has been both so much over-praised and so unjustly depreciated, that it is a real relief to come upon someone who, like Mr Symons, can admire without idolatry, and acknowledge the poet's faults without representing him as a mere foil to Wordsworth or Shelley. He finds the keynote of Byron's life in his love of experience and sensation: Byron really saw life as a romantic adventure and his so-called 'pose,' which might indeed be a pose with another temperament, is with him perfectly sincere: 'he turned life, as it came to him, into an impossible kind of romance, invented by one who was romantic somewhat in the sense that a man becomes romantic when he loves....Convinced that "the great object of life is sensation—to feel that we exist, even though in pain," Byron was constantly satisfying himself of the latter part of his conviction.' Mr Symons admits that there is a great deal in Byron which

is merely oratorical, but thinks that, when the false glitter is removed, there still remains abundance of genuine metal. His romances have much 'pseudo-passion,' but also much real passion. The one thing that is always lacking in Byron is the sense of style, as really great poets possess it; he is too careless and impatient to attain perfection, and though he abounds in magnificent lines, he has no long passages, scarcely any stanzas which are truly perfect:

> What is not there is precisely the magic which seems to make poetry its finer self, the perfume of the flower, that by which the flower is remembered, after its petals have dropped or withered.

It is not just to rank Byron as a mere actor; he may be that sometimes, but he is much more:

> He is fundamentally sincere, which is the root of greatness; he has a firm hold on himself and on the world; he speaks to humanity in its own voice, heightened to a pitch which carries across Europe.

The secret of his great appeal to the average man lies in this fact—that with him as with the average man the world is overpoweringly real, is, indeed, the one thing that truly exists:

> This quality of humanity was genius to him, and stood to him in the place of imagination. Whatever is best in his work is full of this kind of raw or naked humanity.

Shelley too hated custom and convention and the insular spirit of England, but it was not possible for him to lead the revolt against them half so effectively as Byron did, if only because they were so much less actual to him than to Byron, who was great enough to be profoundly discontented with the world, yet neither escaped from it, nor wished to escape; he loved life so dearly, that he wished to snatch and keep it as it slipped by:

> To Byron life itself was imaginative, not the mere raw stuff out of which imagination could shape something quite different, something far more beautiful, but itself, its common hours, the places he passed on the way, a kind of poem in action. All his verse is an attempt to make his own poetry out of fragments of this great poem of life.

It was this keen sense of actuality which made Byron so eager for fame; being vividly conscious of the world he wished the world to be vividly conscious of him, and he succeeded, for he loomed with astonishing greatness in the mind of his age:

> He could write of the Alps and fill the imagination of Europe with the mere fact of his presence there; adding history to Waterloo, because 'his tread was on an empire's dust,' when the history of that field had only just written itself.

Byron, maintains the author, is in many ways characteristically English; he has the English love of travel as Burton and Borrow had it: 'a world to roam through' is a necessity of his nature. So far as style is concerned, Byron, though he cannot rival other poets in purely poetic achievement, has a manner of his own in which he is unequalled—the colloquial. This is especially valuable to him in

his own sphere, as the man of the world; he is one of the few poets for whom society really exists, as human nature exists. His feeling for history is amazingly strong. 'Byron's thought...embraced Europe as another man's thought might have embraced the village from which he had risen.'

Notwithstanding all his great qualities the poet never achieved peace or tranquillity sufficient to possess his own soul, and the disturbance he created in others reacted injuriously upon himself:

> How is content in life possible to those condemned to go about like magnets, attracting or repelling every animate thing, and tormented by the restlessness which their mere presence communicates to the air about them?

After his Byron Mr Symons' Shelley is disappointing. In his view the poet is, except in lyric, little better than Matthew Arnold's 'ineffectual angel.' He sees Shelley mainly as a visionary, a mystic unattached to earth, having no roots in reality. He surely fails to do justice to the fact that much of Shelley's work was produced by a very young man, and that it shows, even in a brief space, the most striking development in sanity and power of thought. We have only, for example, to compare the Shelley of *Queen Mab* with the Shelley of *Prometheus Unbound*, to see how far his mind had advanced in the interval. In the earlier poem he is an atheist of the most rampant and furious kind, who regards Christ as a mere imposter. In *Prometheus Unbound* Christ has become the supreme type of all human virtue, and the sight of his torture is the chief agony that the Titan has to endure. In the same way Shelley's philosophy shows an advance from mere Voltaireanism to Platonism, and from Platonism to a still wider synthesis; for in *The Triumph of Life* he represents Plato among those who, though dazzlingly great are still not the conquerors but the conquered of life. But this progressive advance in thought and sanity Mr Symons altogether neglects: he treats Shelley as if the poet were, from beginning to end, what another critic has called him, 'a footless bird of Paradise.' Occasionally too there are statements which seem inaccurate. Why, for instance, does Mr Symons say 'the daisy, which was the eye of day to Chaucer, is not visible as a speck in Shelley's wide landscape'? Surely the fact is that Shelley has written of the daisy almost as tenderly and even more beautifully than Chaucer himself:

> Daisies, those pearl'd Arcturi of the earth,
> The constellated flower that never sets.

And there is another similar reference:

> Where the melting hoar-frost wets
> The daisy-star that never sets.

This example is important, because Mr Symons takes it as typical of Shelley's whole method, and the deduction seems as misleading as the example.

Still there are many fine observations. We may quote this of *Epipsychidion*:

> Just because it is without personal passion, because it is the worship of a shadow for a shadow, it has come to be this thing fearfully and wonderfully made, into which the mystical passion of Crashaw and the passionate casuistry of Donne seem to have passed as into a crucible,...and the draught is an elixir for all lovers.

Mr Symons also does full justice to Shelley's all-pervading grace of style:

> Not only verse but poetry came to him so naturally that he could not keep it out, and the least fragment he wrote has poetry in it.

He praises the astonishing fineness of Shelley's technique, technique which seems an inspiration, it is so absolutely flawless. He says of the blank verse:

> It has an illumined gravity, a shining crystal clearness, a luminous motion, with, in its ample tide, an 'ocean-like enchantment of strong sound' and a measure and order as of the paces of the boundless and cadenced sea.

And of the lyrics:

> For spiritual energy the *Ode to the West Wind*, for untamable choric rapture the *Hymn to Pan*, for soft brilliance of colour and radiant light the *Lines written among the Euganean Hills*, are not less incomparable than the rarest of the songs ...in which the spirit of Fletcher seems returned to earth with a new magic from beyond the moon.

Like that on Shelley the essay on Keats suffers to some degree from the absence of any attempt to trace the development in the poet's mind and the gradual strengthening of his art, but there is much that is illuminating and suggestive. We may take, for instance, this passage:

> All that swooning and trembling of his lovers, which English critics have found so unmanly, would at all events be very much at home in modern French poetry, where love is again, as it was to Catullus and to Propertius, a sickness, a poisoning or an exhausting madness. To find anything like the same frank subtlety of expression, we must, in English poetry, go back to the Elizabethan age, to which Keats so often comes as a kind of echo.

A great deal of Mr Symons' best work occurs in his studies of men who are not quite first rate such as Campbell, Moore and Landor. In Campbell he finds a great deal merely conventional and much that is quite *banal*; his one real passion was the passion for liberty; his love for his country was part of a wider human enthusiasm, and he was a patriot of all oppressed nationalities:

> The dust from Kosciusko's grave, cast by a Polish patriot into the grave of Campbell in Westminster Abbey was a last appropriate homage to one who had always been 'the sanguine friend of freedom.'

The essay on Landor gives a keen and subtle analysis of that writer's genius—his classical aroma, his peculiar stateliness and charm—while freely admitting his limitations. Mr Symons traces both his qualities and his defects to his use of Latin as a poetic vehicle, and his

absorption of the Latin spirit; he unites 'whatever is characteristically English and whatever is characteristically Roman with the defects of every quality.' Landor's poems have virtues hardly found elsewhere in English, 'an exceptional, evasive, almost illegitimate charm'; but in attempting to make English do the work of Latin, he both strained its resources and neglected to avail himself of its true genius:

> With a far less instinctive sense of the capacities of his own language than Herrick, Landor refused to admit that what might make a poem in Latin could fail to be a poem in English. He won over many secrets from that close language; but the ultimate secrets of his own language he never discovered.

The extracts given will be sufficient to show the value of the book; we need only add that something worthy of notice is to be found on almost every page.

L. Winstanley.

Aberystwyth.

*A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles.* Edited by Sir James A. H. Murray. *Prophesy—Pyxis* (part of Vol. vii). Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1909. 4to. 204 pp.

The ultimate completion and success of this monumental work is now practically ensured. This 'treble section' completes Vol. vii (O—P), the whole of which has been edited by Sir James Murray himself. But this is not all; for we also have in hand the whole of the letter Q, a considerable portion of R, and the first section of S, for all of which Dr Craigie and Dr Bradley are responsible. The indefatigable editor of O and P is already beginning, in the most literal sense, to 'tackle' T, after some preliminary skirmishes with 'tabby,' 'taboo,' and 'tabor.'

Thus the portion already completed is more than three-fourths, and the remainder is well in hand and making good progress. The work stands in a very different position to that which it occupied in the early days which we can well remember, when the first considerable portion made its somewhat tardy appearance, extending to 352 pages, and labelled *A—Ant.* 'Read from *A* to *Ant*, thou sluggard; consider thy words, and be wise' was then a fitting comment.

It is a singular fact, only known to such as have had considerable lexicographical experience, that the difficulty of English words is influenced, to an appreciable extent, by the nature of the initial letter. Words beginning with the labial letters P, F, B are likely, upon the whole, to present peculiar difficulties; and, of all the letters in the alphabet, the worst to deal with is P. It contains words from a very large number of different languages, and but a comparatively small portion of these is of native origin. Further it contains, with the sole exception of S, a greater number of words than any other letter of the alphabet; even more than C, which in this respect comes near it. It is therefore a good thing that it has fallen to the lot of the original editor

of A, who has brought to bear upon it all his vast experience; with the result that it may fairly be said, without instituting needless comparisons, that this difficult letter is as well done as any.

One of the most painful tasks, in such a work, is to exercise the art of compression. The mass of material is so great that it is difficult to know what to reject; yet much must be done in that direction. This difficult art, which the reader is not called upon to consider, comes from great practice only; and it is on that account worth considering the published results regarding C and P. C contains 21,295 main words, and P has 23,182; nevertheless, whilst C occupies 1308 pages, P takes but 1320; or only 12 extra pages for 1887 words, which is well under the average. Such a result is unlikely to be noticed by any who consult the Dictionary to solve their difficulties; but it is the outcome of increased skill, and should excite the admiration of such as understand what it means.

The celebrated words of Virgil—'mobilitate uiget, uiresque acquirit eundo'—were originally spoken of Fame, which he regarded as an evil—'malum.' But we may fairly apply them, of course in a good sense, to the progress of the Dictionary. Its steady movement assists it; it is ever being better done, and it can now be done more quickly. This is especially true with regard to cross-references. When the letter C was in hand, reference to S was sometimes necessary, and there was nothing to refer to but the vast mass of written 'slips'—originally 'rudis indigestaque moles,' as was said of chaos, though afterwards reduced to a sufficient order by diligent and patient sorting. But now, the editor of S who would refer to C, or to any other letter down to Q, has ready to hand, practically, all that is known or can be said. The difference is obvious, even to the inexperienced. For this, and for many other reasons, the end of the work is now assured to us, and that within no very long time. The last quarter will prove to be the easiest and the quickest.

To return to particulars as to *Prophesy—Pyxis*. 'As in the other sections of P, the words of native origin are very few. Of the 3874 Main Words not more than 16 [!] are to be found in an Old English or Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, and of them *provost, psalm, psalter, pumice, punt* sb.[1], *purple,* and *purse* were merely learned borrowings from Latin; one, *proud,* was from Old French; of those apparently Teutonic (and there probably onomatopœic), only *puff, pull,* and *put* are now words of importance. All three were words of rare use and late occurrence in Old English; and few things in the history of words are more remarkable than the development of the obscure *pull* and *put* into the much-used and hard-worked words which they have become in modern English. The article on *put* indeed is, next to that on *go,* the longest as yet in the Dictionary; and the ramifications of sense and use in the simple verb have made its arrangement a work of enormous difficulty. The sense-development of a word is not confined to a lineal order; not even, like that of a tree, to space of three dimensions; hence, the best order that can be attained in a dictionary, being merely linear (one line,

or a series of variously connected successive lines), can only very imperfectly represent the facts. It is hoped, however, that the arrangement of senses here adopted will help to guide the reader through the maze of uses which *put* is made to serve. As the ground meaning of the verb has become so attenuated, its work is now largely done by combination with adverbs, *put about, put aside, put away, put down, put off, put on*, etc.; and several of these adverbial combinations themselves form larger articles than many a simple verb: *put out* is used in 23, and *put up* in 35 varieties of sense. Of the other words in this section, the majority are, as usual [i.e., in P], from Old French, Latin, and Greek.'

We have quoted this terse description in full, because it cannot be better put. But we do not propose to be put about by reading the whole article on this Protean verb at once, neither do we desire to put it all aside or away; still less, to put the editor down, or to put him off with faint praise. We can see that he has put in a good deal of hard work, and are glad that his patience could put up with it. We thank him, accordingly, for putting it together, and for putting it through. Truly, a convenient verb, and worthy of much respect.

Under *propose*, we have a quotation dated as late as 1898, for the famous proverb—'Man proposes, God disposes,' with a cross-reference to *dispose*, where the Latin original is given; from Thomas a Kempis, *De Imitatione*, i, 19. Earlier instances are given from *Melusine*, xxxvi, 265, ab. 1500, and Sanderson's Sermons, ii, 302 (1634). It is worth adding that it is quoted twice, in its Latin form, in *Piers Plowman*, B. xi, 36, and C. xxiii, 34. I have already pointed out in the Notes, that it was suggested by Prov. xvi, 9.

In several cases, the ordinary account of a word, such as we should expect to find, has been supplemented by a short essay on its use, of a character without parallel in our older dictionaries; and it is written just as carefully as if the number of words beginning with P had been a mere handful, instead of amounting, as is the fact, to more than 20,000. Such an essay appears under 'psychological,' with reference to the phrase 'at the psychological moment.' It is shown that the present use of it arose in French, at the time of the siege of Paris in 1870, and was due to an error in translating the original German phrase *das psychologische Moment*, in which *Moment*, being neuter, signified 'momentum,' and not 'an instant of time,' as when it is masculine. After such mistranslation, it was imported into England, where it has been joyously adopted in our 'journalese' talk, in despite of its absurdity, with an imaginary sense of 'at the critical instant.' As an instant of time cannot be affected by psychology, it is too unmeaning to be really jocose, and has become no better than silly. But it will probably long continue to be employed by writers who do not even understand their own expressions. Like the 'blessed word' Mesopotamia, it has a pompous sound.

Those who delight in long words may find here some to their mind. We notice, for instance, such fine specimens as *psychopannychy, psychrolute, psydracium, pteraspidian, pteropodous, pterygoblast, pterylographical*,

*ptochology, ptyalagogue, ptysmagogue, pundigrion* (happily obsolescent, if not obsolete), *pygobranchiate, pylethrombosis, pyracanthine* (in Blackmore's *Mary Anerley*, iii, 255), *pyrenocarp, pyretogenesis, pyromeconic*, and a great many more. Those who are thirsting to use such terms may here learn precisely what they mean.

There are a considerable number of words from East Indian and Persian, and it is surprising to observe how familiar some of them have become, as, e.g., *puggree, pundit, punkah, puttee*, and *pyjama*. *Puttee* is merely the English spelling of the Hindi *paṭṭī*, a bandage, related to the Skt. *paṭī*, a strip of cloth, and *paṭa*, a piece of woven stuff. It is interesting to discover that it has a cognate in English; for, as Uhlenbeck notes, the cerebral *t* arose from *lt*, so that it is connected with the Gk. δι-πλάσιος, two-fold, Goth. *falth-an*, and E. *fold*; with allusions to the *folds* in which the puttee lies.

WALTER W. SKEAT.

CAMBRIDGE.

*Større Engelsk Grammatik*, af OTTO JESPERSEN. I. Lyd og Skrift. Copenhagen: Gyldendal. 1909. 8vo. viii + 251 pp.

*A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles.* By OTTO JESPERSEN. Part I. Sounds and Spellings. Heidelberg: Winter. 1909. 8vo. xi + 485 pp.

Sincere and cordial congratulations must be offered to Professor Jespersen on the completion of the first part of the great task that he has set himself, a task which is, in his own words, 'to represent English Grammar not as a set of dogmatic precepts, according to which some things are correct and others absolutely wrong, but as something living and developing under continual fluctuations and undulations, something that is founded on the past and prepares the way for the future, something that is not always consistent or perfect, but progressing and perfectible.'

Many excellent historical grammars have appeared in the past, but their fatal defect, at least for present day interest is, that they tend to stop short at the middle of the sixteenth century as if the language had then become stereotyped; and if anything is said of the next three centuries, a few chapters or paragraphs suffice. Professor Jespersen on the other hand devotes fully one half of his book to the changes which have taken place since the middle of the sixteenth century and this is much nearer the true proportion of things; for it is no exaggeration to say that the twentieth century differs quite as much from the sixteenth in its pronunciation of English, as does the English of the reign of Elizabeth from that of William the Conqueror. This difference of proportion is due to the fact that the author treats of the history of sounds and not of symbols, or rather he only touches on change of symbol so far as it represents change of sound. The basis of his grammar is phonetic and not

alphabetic; therefore he is not deluded by the comparatively slight changes of form in modern English, into the common error of neglecting the later history of our language, because in the printed book Victorian English differs very little from Elizabethan.

For the pronunciation of English previous to the sixteenth century Dr Jespersen's sources and his methods of using them are much the same as those of preceding writers; but for later centuries he has made a fuller and more systematic use of the various sources of information than has ever been made before. He has ransacked books on pronunciation, old grammars and dictionaries, he throws light on many points by reference to the pronunciations of modern dialect and he is full of happy illustrations drawn from his own personal observation of English speech and his own study of modern English novels and dramas, so far as their spelling permits of inferences as to modern pronunciation. It has been a source of reproach to English scholars in the past that most of our best historical grammars were the work of foreign hands; far greater is the reproach that the first historical grammar which is based largely on accurate observation of present-day speech, should be the work of one who must necessarily labour under such great initial disadvantages.

As regards the general scheme of the book, we have already mentioned its phonetic basis. It may also be pointed out that Dr Jespersen strikes out a new line in taking as the basis from which his investigation starts the English pronunciation of the days of Chaucer, and working first backwards and then forwards from that time. This new scheme of work may not be entirely an advantage, but like all Dr Jespersen's methods it tends to throw new light on various obscure points. The chief disadvantage is a certain loss of the sense of continuous development from the earliest days onward.

The fifth and the ninth chapters, dealing with Stress and with Vowels in unstressed syllables respectively, are specially mentioned by Professor Jespersen as those in which he 'enjoyed the feeling of treading on virgin soil.' His feeling will be shared by his readers, at least in the former of the two chapters. His distinction of the various forces determining stress—rhythm, tradition, unity, analogy, contrast, heaviness, psychologic importance—is invaluable. Rhythmic stress (in word and sentence) and unity stress (in compounds) have largely been neglected in the past and the part they play is by no means an unimportant one. The author is most at home however in revealing the curious interplay of influences which goes on between the various forms of stress; and the subtle way in which he destroys the common idea of the 'capriciousness' of English accent, and brings all its vagaries under rule and order, is a pleasure to study.

The scope of the book is so broad, its mass of detail so great, that it is impossible within the limits of a review to discuss the many small points on which one might be inclined to disagree with the author. At times he seems to have failed to secure or appreciate the ordinary pronunciation of certain words, at others there are additional illustrations

which might be suggested as bringing out his points more clearly. Occasionally, and it is only very occasionally, the English is slightly at fault as in 'nominative' (p. 366) or the curious use of 'étapes' (p. 319), where it seems that the English equivalent would do just as well. More space too is devoted to homonyms than is necessary in a work of this kind. But all these are mere blemishes, and we can look forward with unfeigned interest to the second part of Dr Jespersen's book, where, in the study of syntax at least, he will largely have the joy of opening up virgin lands.

At the same time that Dr Jespersen is publishing his larger English Grammar he is issuing an abbreviated Danish edition for the use of the large number of students of English in his own country. The study of English is now carried out on more thorough and scientific lines in Denmark than perhaps in any other European country, and this happy result is largely due to the efforts of Dr Jespersen himself. That his work is fully recognised in his own country is pleasantly evidenced by the fact that this book is produced with the financial support both of the Minister of Education and of the University printing fund. Dr Jespersen's work has also received happy recognition in America during the last year, when he has lectured in the California and Columbia Universities.

The Danish edition differs from the English chiefly in the omission of a good deal of historical matter. Everything which relates to the pronunciation and general usages of modern English, remains in the same form as in the larger work; and this secondary purpose, of adapting the book for the use of Danish students of modern English, explains the presence in the larger edition of some of the features which there seem open to criticism, as, for example, the disproportionate space devoted to homonyms. Lists of homonyms, in fact, may be extremely useful to foreigners who are learning English, though they are of little value to the student of historical grammar; and in this case the treatment has probably been determined by considerations of practical utility.

ALLEN MAWER.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

*The Eight-text Edition of the Canterbury Tales.* By W. W. SKEAT. (Chaucer Society.) London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1909. 8vo. viii + 64 pp.

This little book contains a considerable variety of interesting matter. The eight texts are those which have been printed in full by the Chaucer Society, that is to say, those contained in the 'six-text' edition, with those of MS. Harl. 7334 and the Camb. Univ. MS. Dd. 4. 24. Professor Skeat gives us first a collection of the titles, glosses, remarks and side-notes which are found in these manuscripts, and then a collation of the eight texts, shewing the exact contents of each, and noting the insertions and

omissions; next an examination of the characteristics of the Harleian MS.; and then a discussion on the classification of the MSS. generally, with special reference to the theory set forth in Professor Skeat's previous essay, *The Evolution of the Canterbury Tales.* Finally a few particular points of criticism are dealt with separately. The most interesting part of the book is the further elucidation which we have of the evolution theory, which the author says has not been sufficiently understood. Dr Skeat, as is well known, believes that several successive attempts on the part of the author to produce a satisfactory arrangement of the tales which he had written may be traced in the existing manuscripts, that the Hengwrt MS. represents the earliest of these attempts and in general the oldest form of the text, belonging to a period when the Canon's Yeoman had not yet been introduced into the *Canterbury Tales,* and that successive stages of revision and arrangement are represented by the Petworth, Lansdowne, Harleian and Ellesmere copies, the last being a text which was produced by a process of editing, with the help of the 'Harleian' revision, after the death of the author. Dr Skeat here tests his theory by applying it to the explanation of the variations in some of the connecting links and prologues. Before his theory of chronological order can be established, however, a far more complete examination must be made of the manuscripts generally than has yet been attempted. It must be shewn much more convincingly that the text variations of the Hengwrt and the Lansdowne MSS., for example, are not merely individual peculiarities, but sufficient to characterise definite types, which may possibly have proceeded from the author, as did the successive editions of the *Confessio Amantis,* which are characterised, it must be remembered, in each case, not only by variations in the form of dedication and conclusion, but also by a large number of distinctive readings, in which all manuscripts of the group agree. It would be curious, to say the least of it, if no fewer than five of the eight texts selected by the Chaucer Society for publication should prove to be representative of distinct arrangements of the text proceeding from the author.

In the meantime, however, it is interesting to note how far this working hypothesis is capable of saving the phenomena, and Dr Skeat's theory about the history of the connecting links and prologues is at least worthy of attention. He deals fully with two passages, first that which in most modern editions is placed, with hardly any manuscript authority, as a link between the Man of Law and the Shipman (B 1163—1190), but is omitted altogether by the Ellesmere, Hengwrt and two Cambridge University MSS., and in most of the others has the reading 'Squier' for 'Shipman,' in l. 1179, with the Squire's Tale following, while in some, including Harleian 7334, we find the reading 'Sompnour,' though the Sompnour's Tale does not follow. Then secondly there is the link which in the ordinary texts connects the Squire and Franklin, on the authority of the Ellesmere and Harleian MSS., but in a large number of MSS. is used, with the reading 'Marchant' for 'Frankeleyn,' as a connection between Squire and

Merchant (these being among the copies in which Squire follows Man of Law).

According to Dr Skeat's theory the original type of text should be that which is given in the Hengwrt copy, where the former of these two passages is not found at all, and the second occurs as a link between the Squire and the Merchant. The Petworth MS. should supply the next stage of development, and here the former passage appears as link between Man of Law and Squire, while the other still connects Squire and Merchant. The Lansdowne text agrees with this as regards the link between Man of Law and Squire, but the Merchant's Tale has been removed and now follows the Clerk without a connecting link, the Squire-Merchant link disappearing. Next the Harleian removes the Squire's Tale to a later place and connects it with the Franklin's by utilising what was formerly the link between Squire and Merchant, while a skilful connection is supplied between Clerk and Merchant. In the Man of Law's end-link 'Sompnour' is substituted for 'Squier,' though the Wife of Bath immediately follows, and the now inappropriate link is broken off five lines from the end. The Ellesmere MS. agrees with this arrangement, except in the fact that the Man of Law's end-link is here omitted altogether.

This statement involves an interesting theory about the possible order of events, but the acceptance of it must depend upon the evidence which may be produced that the manuscripts in question really do represent successive revisions by the hand of the author, and especially that the Hengwrt copy gives us a pure and not a contaminated form of text. One serious difficulty is the close resemblance of Hengwrt and Ellesmere (the supposed earliest and latest forms) in the general character of their text; and another is that of supposing that Chaucer wrote the Man of Law's end-link originally with a view to the Squire. The inappropriateness of it in this application must occur to every reader, as it occurred to Tyrwhitt, and it is almost impossible to believe that such a violation of dramatic propriety was due to the author. We hope that Professor Skeat will continue his labours, and will be able to remove some at least of the difficulties which at present stand in the way of the acceptance of his theory.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

*From Montaigne to Molière, or the Preparation for the Classical Age of French Literature.* By Arthur Tilley. London: John Murray. 1908. 8vo. viii + 265 pp.

Dans la préface de son livre, l'auteur nous indique très nettement le plan qu'il s'est tracé. Il ne s'est pas proposé d'écrire une histoire de la littérature française pendant la période de transition qui va de la Renaissance à 1660, mais seulement d'indiquer 'the various forces, political, religious, social and literary, which helped to bring about this

change.' Il ajoute (p. 12) que, pour ce qui concerne toute la première partie de cette période—jusqu'en 1636,—'our attention will be directed rather to political, religious and social forces than to purely literary ones.' Voilà des déclarations pleines de promesses et que nous enregistrons avec un plaisir d'autant plus vif qu'il nous est plus rarement offert. Je me fais un devoir de déclarer tout d'abord que ces promesses, M. Tilley les a tenues, au moins dans l'ensemble. Malgré les remarques que j'aurai à lui adresser sur plusieurs points, j'ai trouvé dans son livre, à côté d'une exactitude et d'une sûreté de documentation à laquelle ses travaux précédents nous avaient déjà habitués, beaucoup d'idées justes, souvent neuves. Les 'courants directeurs' comme les appellerait G. Brandes, qui dominent la littérature d'avant 1660, sont mis en relief avec une netteté remarquable, et sur tous les points qui prêtent à la controverse, M. Tilley appuie son opinion d'arguments basés sur une solide et consciencieuse érudition.

Malheureusement, la méthode suivie par lui offrait un danger qu'il ne me semble pas avoir évité. Il était à craindre que ces 'courants directeurs'—étudiés tour à tour et à part, chaque étude formant un tout homogène—ne fissent l'impression de quelque chose de morcelé, de décousu, comme d'autant d''essais' isolés qui auraient été réunis en volume après coup. N'est-ce pas Chateaubriand qui reprochait jadis au paganisme d'avoir 'rapetissé la nature' en la subdivisant en une infinité de petits compartiments, dont chacun était placé sous l'égide d'une divinité spéciale? Mais le christianisme est venu, et désormais, 'libres de ce troupeau de dieux ridicules qui les bornaient de toutes parts, les bois se sont remplis d'une divinité immense.' Je ne sais pourquoi, en fermant le livre de M. Tilley, cette phrase de Chateaubriand m'est revenue à la mémoire. J'ai eu le sentiment que, faute d'une ou deux grandes idées générales capables de servir de lien entre les différents chapitres et d'assurer l'unité de l'ensemble, le livre restait pour ainsi dire fragmentaire.

Je sais bien que M. Tilley ne s'est pas proposé d'écrire 'a complete history' (il a soin de nous en avertir dans la préface), mais justement il me semble que, sans sortir le moins du monde du cadre qu'il s'était tracé, rien n'était plus facile que d'enchaîner les différents chapitres, en les reliant à deux ou trois idées centrales. Par exemple, ne semble-t-il pas extraordinaire que, dans un volume consacré aux différentes 'forces' qui ont agi sur toute cette littérature, celles que l'on pourrait considérer comme les deux principales, celles en tout cas dont *l'effet* s'est fait le plus généralement sentir, soient presque complétement ignorées—je veux dire l'esprit héroïque et le libertinage? Et pourtant, on pourrait presque affirmer qu'il n'est pas un volume publié entre 1630 et 1660 qui ne se rattache naturellement, soit à l'une soit à l'autre de ces deux influences!

Je prends le mot héroïque, non pas dans son sens précis et étroit, mais dans le sens plus large et plus élastique qu'on lui attribue d'ordinaire en pareil cas. L'esprit héroïque, c'est d'une part le goût du romanesque, des sentiments exaltés, des actions d'éclat, de l'autre, c'est

l'énergie du tempérament, la force de volonté, la maîtrise de soi—c'est à peu près ce que le président Roosevelt appelait si heureusement 'the strenuous life.'

Romanesques ou énergiques—souvent les deux ensemble—voilà justement ce qu'ont été tous les hommes de cette génération, les hommes qui ont fait la guerre de Trente ans et la Fronde—et puisque, si l'on en croit Voltaire, le mot 'homme' est 'un terme générique qui embrasse la femme,' je ne vois pas pourquoi nous exclurions les femmes, celles qui ont servi de modèles aux héroïnes viriles de Corneille (qu'on se rappelle la Grande Mademoiselle dirigeant l'artillerie au fort de Vincennes). Si la littérature est 'l'expression des sociétés' n'y avait-il pas là une belle occasion de rattacher la littérature aux mœurs, en recherchant l'origine de cet 'Esprit héroïque' et en montrant comment il a pénétré à la fois toutes les branches de la littérature?

Au théâtre, c'est le *Cid*, *Cinna*, ou même l'Alidor de la Place Royale. Le Roman est 'héroïque,' avec *Cyrus*, *Clélie*, et plus tard *La Princesse de Clèves*, si Cornélienne à certains égards. Dans la Poésie, les principaux personnages de l'épopée sont Clovis et Charlemagne, St Louis et Jeanne d'Arc, les grands 'héros' de l'histoire nationale. Héroïques, aussi les mémoires, avec Retz et La Rochefoucauld.

En philosophie, c'est Descartes avec son traité des passions et sa fameuse théorie de la Volonté. Et qu'est-ce que la Préciosité, sinon, en un certain sens, une forme féminine de l'Esprit héroïque? Ces femmes remarquables n'ont pas seulement la distinction, la délicatesse de l'esprit et des manières, elles ont l'énergique volonté d'agir sur les mœurs, de relever le niveau intellectuel de leur sexe, le niveau social des gens de lettres, etc. Qu'est-ce que le Jansénisme, sinon la 'strenuous life' dans le domaine de la religion et de la morale? Et le burlesque lui-même est-il autre chose que l'héroïsme tourné au grotesque? Il n'y a pas eu, je le veux bien, d'intention critique, de la part de Scarron et de ses émules (cf. p. 189), mais il n'en est pas moins vrai que le *Virgile Travesti*, *Don Japhet d'Arménie*, etc., appartiennent au genre héroïque ('mock-heroic' si l'on veut) et seraient aussi incompréhensibles sans lui que *Don-Quichotte* sans la chevalerie.

Quant au libertinage, ou à l'esprit gaulois (peu importe le terme), je n'ai pas besoin de montrer qu'on peut y rattacher la plupart des ouvrages d'où l'esprit héroïque est absent. Cela est trop évident.

Voilà donc deux courants qui comptent parmi les plus importants de cette partie du dix-septième siècle. J'irai plus loin: M. Tilley se propose de faciliter aux étudiants de la littérature l'intelligence du Naturalisme Classique, auquel son livre sert pour ainsi dire d'Introduction. Or ce Naturalisme n'a pu s'imposer qu'en s'opposant à l'Esprit héroïque, c'est contre l'héroïque sous toutes ses formes que Boileau a tout d'abord dirigé les traits de sa satire. Il était donc de la plus haute importance que ce courant fût étudié à fond, dans ses origines et dans ses manifestations. M. Tilley lui consacre (p. 95) quelques phrases isolées; il nous dit par exemple que: 'In Gomberville's hands, the pastoral romance had been transformed into the heroic romance'—mais

sans avoir l'idée de rattacher ces romans à un courant général. Au bas de la page, il reconnaît que 'M. Morillot has well pointed out the analogies between the romances of La Calprenède and the plays of Corneille.' C'est tout. Il est permis de trouver que ce n'est pas assez. Quant aux libertins, ils sont mentionnés une fois, et cela tout à la fin du volume (p. 237).

Je regrette aussi que M. Tilley ait remis jusqu'à la page 245 sa courte—trop courte—étude sur Balzac (deux pages), alors que tout au début de son volume il consacre un chapitre entier à Malherbe. L'influence de ces deux écrivains ayant été absolument identique, ils auraient, croyons nous, dû être étudiés ensemble. Balzac a fait pour la prose exactement ce que Malherbe a fait pour le vers. Tous deux ont réalisé en des formes d'art les mêmes idées critiques, tous deux ont éliminé l'individuel de leurs œuvres, et si Malherbe est plus connu, c'est, comme le dit Brunetière, à cause du 'privilège de poésie.'

Et puis, j'aurais voulu que M. Tilley, après nous avoir montré en Balzac 'a master of rhetoric and of the formal qualities of style,' ne se contentât pas d'en citer un extrait et de laisser le lecteur se débrouiller tout seul. J'aurais voulu qu'il nous montrât, exemples à l'appui, en quoi a consisté la 'trouvaille' de Balzac, et comment il fut le premier à comprendre que le caractère analytique du français rendait impossibles les longs circuits de la période cicéronienne, qu'il fallait au contraire s'efforcer d'isoler les idées, de les enfermer dans leurs limites logiques, de mettre un peu d'"air' dans la phrase.

À la page 33 je relève cette phrase: 'In these (songs), Desportes comes, perhaps, nearest to our Cavalier poets, especially to the easy grace of Suckling.' Il y a à cela une excellente raison, c'est que Suckling a imité et même fréquemment traduit Desportes. La vérité est donc, non pas que Desportes approche de la grâce aisée de Suckling, mais que Suckling approche de la grâce aisée de Desportes.

Le troisième chapitre, intitulé 'the Catholic Revival,' m'a très vivement intéressé. C'est un sujet qui a été malheureusement trop négligé par les critiques français et dont M. Tilley a compris toute l'importance. Son chapitre est rempli de faits—et d'idées. C'est certainement le plus original du volume, et aussi celui qui a nécessité le plus de recherches personnelles. J'ai surtout beaucoup profité des renseignements qu'il donne—d'après M. Allier—sur la fameuse cabale des dévots, ou, pour l'appeler par son vrai nom, la Compagnie du Saint Sacrement. Il y a là des révélations tout à fait intéressantes et qui jettent un jour curieux sur la genèse de *Tartuffe*. Mais pourquoi, dans un chapitre consacré au 'Catholic revival' M. Tilley ne dit-il pas un mot du Jansénisme? Je sais bien qu'il en parle, tout à la fin du livre (à propos de Pascal), et que c'était bien là en effet, le lieu et le moment de l'étudier à fond. Mais les *origines* du Jansénisme, et l'importance qu'il devait bientôt prendre, auraient dû être indiquées au chapitre III. De même, en effet, que la Renaissance païenne fut suivie d'une renaissance du catholicisme, la Réforme calviniste devait être suivie d'une tentative de réforme *dans* le catholicisme. La première fut

surtout l'œuvre des Jésuites (M. Tilley n'a peut-être pas assez insisté sur ce point) et la seconde fut l'œuvre des Jansénistes, et les deux me semblent inséparables, tout comme Malherbe et Balzac.

Les chapitres VII et VIII sont consacrés respectivement à la Tragédie Classique et à la Comédie. Il y avait sans doute certains avantages à les étudier à part, mais il y avait aussi un inconvénient dont M. Tilley ne semble pas avoir reconnu toute la gravité, celui de couper Corneille en deux, d'un côté un Corneille tragique, de l'autre un Corneille comique, qui ont l'air de ne rien se devoir l'un à l'autre. Et cela est bien regrettable, surtout en ce qui concerne *le Cid*. Je veux bien que *le Cid* marque le véritable point de départ de la Tragédie Classique, mais ce dont je suis parfaitement certain, c'est que *le Cid* se rattache bien plus directement aux comédies ou tragi-comédies qui l'ont précédé—la Place Royale et l'Illusion Comique par exemple—qu'à *Horace* ou à *Polyeucte*, et qu'il est impossible de comprendre la genèse du Cid si on le sépare violemment de la chaîne dont il est un anneau. Par exemple, la théorie de 'l'amour soumis à la volonté' est déjà tout entière dans la Place Royale (cf. le rôle d'Alidor). Il semblerait même, si l'on en croit la curieuse Dédicace de la pièce (à un certain M***), que cette fameuse théorie ne soit pas du crû de Corneille, mais qu'elle lui ait été suggérée par une autre personne—à laquelle Corneille exprime, en termes non équivoques, toute sa reconnaissance du service rendu: 'C'est *de vous* que j'ai appris que l'amour d'un honnête homme doit être toujours volontaire....Toute sa morale (d'Alidor) serait plutôt un portrait *de votre conduite* qu'un effort de mon imagination.... Cette *possession de vous même* que vous conservez si parfaite parmi tant d'intrigues...etc.' Il serait bien intéressant de savoir qui est ce M*** auquel Corneille attribue lui-même la paternité d'une de ses principales théories dramatiques. Il y a là un curieux problème d'histoire littéraire.

Les épreuves ne semblent pas avoir été revues avec beaucoup de soin. Les deux vers de Boileau cités à la page 5 sont tous deux estropiés d'une syllabe. Autre vers faux, hideusement faux, à la page 31: Et le peuple qui trembl*a* aux frayeures de la guerre. Autres vers faux ou dénaturés aux pages 144 et 202. Enfin, à la page 63 on trouve trois fois Sainte Lazare pour Saint-Lazare.

Telles sont les remarques que m'a suggérées la lecture du livre de M. Tilley. Peut-être ai-je donné trop de place à la critique des 'défauts' et pas assez à celle des 'beautés.' Je prie M. Tilley de vouloir bien y trouver la marque de toute l'estime que j'ai pour son excellent volume. S'il en eût été autrement, quelques lignes auraient suffi. Si je me suis attaché, peut-être un peu trop longuement, à certaines critiques de détail, c'est justement parce que je suis sûr que son livre mérite d'obtenir les suffrages d'un nombreux public—public de lettrés et d'étudiants, auxquels il sera d'une très réelle utilité. J'ai été surtout frappé, au cours d'une lecture attentive, par la remarquable sûreté, j'allais presque dire l'infaillibilité, de son érudition; j'ai pris la peine de la mettre à l'épreuve sur tous les points où une erreur de fait

même légère était possible. Jamais je ne l'ai trouvée en défaut. Je tiens à en donner un exemple, entre beaucoup d'autres. À la page 133, M. Tilley parle de la *Tyr et Sidon* de J. de Schélandre. Il y a en réalité deux pièces distinctes, une tragédie publiée en 1608 (dont un exemplaire fut découvert au British Museum en 1883, et un autre à l'Arsenal en 1897), et une tragi-comédie en deux journées, publiée en 1628. Or, les historiens de la littérature Française, les critiques, les auteurs de manuels, les compilateurs de recueils—Weiss, Lacroix (le bibliophile Jacob), Asselineau, P. Jannet (dans son *Ancien Théâtre Français*), Vapereau, Guérard, Faguet, Aulard, Rigal, Doumic—sont unanimes, soit à confondre les deux pièces en une seule, soit à ne voir dans la seconde qu'une simple réimpression de la première—M. Tilley s'est bien gardé de tomber dans l'erreur générale—et cela fait grand honneur à sa perspicacité. Mais pourquoi, au lieu de renvoyer seulement le lecteur à l'édition de la tragi-comédie, M. Tilley ne cite-t-il pas aussi l'excellente édition critique de la tragédie donnée par M. J. Haraszti dans la *Société des Textes Modernes*? Peut-être son volume a-t-il paru peu de temps avant celui de M. Haraszti (ils portent la même date, 1908). En ce cas, les deux auteurs seraient arrivés indépendamment aux mêmes conclusions, et M. Tilley partagerait avec M. Haraszti l'honneur d'avoir remis les choses au point. Ce serait encore une preuve, ajoutée à toutes celles qu'il nous a déjà données, de l'étendue de ses recherches, et de la sûreté de sa documentation.

H. E. Berthon.

Oxford.

*Chapters on Spanish Literature.* By James Fitzmaurice-Kelly. London: Constable and Co. 1908. 8vo. ix + 259 pp.

*Lecciones de Literatura Española.* Por Jaime Fitzmaurice-Kelly. Traducción directa del inglés por Diego Mendoza con un prólogo de Rufino José Cuervo. Madrid: V. Suarez. 1910. 8vo. xxi + 326 pp.

To all lovers of Spanish literature any book from the pen of Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly makes instant appeal, and we find here all that his readers have long since learnt to expect: wide and minute research combined with that lightness of touch and power of selection which are the mark of a true master of his subject. One naturally turns for purposes of comparison to the same author's *History of Spanish Literature*, but here he is able to give much freer play to his powers: he is not cramped by the limitations of the handbook and its inexorable masses of detail. Nor does he repeat himself or merely state afresh opinions already enunciated. He always has something new to tell or some modification to make of previous judgments.

In the opening chapter the real and the, to most of us, far better known legendary Cid are each excellently treated in all their bearings and the interesting question is touched upon as to the indebtedness of the *Poema* and the *Crónica rimada* to early French literature. We have no hesitation in saying that no such excellent account has ever been written of the *Libro de buen amor* (as Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly reminds us is the true title of the work) of the Archpriest of Hita. His foibles, his originality, his poetic genius, in spite of the vast amount of older material he adapts to his purpose, are all most skilfully delineated. Equal praise may be bestowed on the chapter on the Literary Court of Juan II. The prominent figures are brought out with true artistic power and critical insight, and nowhere perhaps is this more marked than in his treatment of Perez de Guzmán and his *Generaciones y Semblanzas*. In the chapter on the *Romancero*, though by far the longest in the book, the author himself admits that he has 'merely brushed the fringe of the subject,' and we hope he will, on some future occasion, find time to return to this most fascinating theme. The succeeding chapters treat of the three greatest figures in Spanish literature. We are glad to see that the slight asperity, with which the author is sometimes inclined to speak in his *History*, of the faults of Cervantes gives place here to a kindlier tone, though none would be disposed to deny, in the opening words of the chapter on the Works of Cervantes that 'the best and wisest of men have their delusions—especially with respect to themselves and their capabilities.' The world would probably have suffered little loss if no other works of Cervantes had survived but *Don Quixote* and the *Novelas Exemplares*, but can we quite agree with Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly that Shakespeare, to anything like the same extent as Cervantes, owes 'to a single masterpiece the greater part of his transcendent fame'?

A prominent feature throughout the book is the extraordinary felicity with which the author has found means in comparatively few pages to sketch the lives of the principal writers, without either overloading the narrative with detail or omitting a single important fact. The lives of Cervantes and of Lope de Vega are admirable productions and show what strides research has made in recent years—labour to which the author has himself contributed in no mean degree. Lope de Vega, as was to be expected, is assigned a higher place as a dramatist than Calderón, this view having now become almost a commonplace, but at the same time he does Calderón ampler justice than in his previous work. A great advance is also shown in his treatment of the Dramatic School of Calderón. The last chapter is devoted to Modern Spanish Novelists, among whom Pereda and Valera naturally take the most prominent place, but the main characteristics of all the leading novelists are excellently portrayed, and nowhere, perhaps, may this be said with greater truth than in the case of living authors like the Condesa Pardo Bazán and Vicente Blasco Ibáñez.

The translator has accomplished his difficult task in a thoroughly competent manner. We have compared many passages where a

foreigner might be expected not to bring out the full force of the original, but we have not in any case found him missing the point. The introduction by Señor Cuervo contains a delicate compliment to the high place which England has always occupied in Spanish studies.

O. H. Fynes-Clinton.

Bangor.

*Dante. Quaestio de Aqua et Terra.* Edited and translated by Charles Lancelot Shadwell. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1909. 8vo. iv + 74 pp.

To the third edition of Dr Moore's *Oxford Dante*, Dr Shadwell contributed a new text of the *De Aqua et Terra*. Previous to this all editions had been entirely unsatisfactory. As is well known no manuscript of this treatise is extant, but fortunately the *Editio Princeps* of 1508 generally gives clear enough indications of the contractions in the MS. which the editor expanded with so little intelligence. Subsequent editors, however, while correcting the grossest of his blunders, left others undetected and introduced confusions and irrelevancies of their own, and it was reserved to Dr Shadwell to produce the first satisfactory text. He did the work so thoroughly as to leave very little to his successors. This text he has now reissued in a separate volume with very slight alterations (I have noticed only the substitution of *quae* for *qua* in § xii, 61, and *quare* for *quia* in § xx, 50), and he has accompanied it with a slight but adequate *apparatus criticus*, a translation, and a brief commentary. There were already four English translations of the work (including Professor Thompson's contribution to Boffito's Polyglot edition), but Dr Shadwell's will at once take undisputed place as the standard version. It would be easy to give numerous examples of his superior insight into the Latinity, whether general or technical, of the treatise, but two may suffice. In the first paragraph he shews that discussing a point *ad apparentiam* does not mean 'according to appearance,' but 'for display'; and in the eighteenth paragraph he unravels with complete success an apparently complicated passage by shewing that *instantiae principalis* means 'the objection brought *against* the principal argument.' Aristotle repeatedly uses the phrase ἔνστασις τούτου for 'an objection urged against this,' and the slavish medieval translations (though Dr Shadwell, who never condescends to depart from the Greek text of his Aristotle, does not supply this link) render the phrase *instantia hujus*. Against the important passages in which Dr Shadwell has seen the true meaning of the text for the first time must be set one or two where (in the judgment at least of the present reviewer) he appears to have gone gratuitously wrong. For instance in § ii, 7, *principium investigandæ veritatis* surely does not mean 'the first step in the investigation of the truth,' since the point in question is the conclusion not the starting-

point, but (on the analogy of parallel passages in the *De Monarchia*) 'for the establishment of a norm by which investigations may be tested.' But such instances, even if they can be established, are in no case of serious or material significance. The commentary, however, is disappointing. It brings nothing fresh of any importance, and in no way advances the discussion of the question of authenticity; and from time to time it shews imperfect acquaintance with the work of Vincenzo Biagi. For instance in his Appendix on the difficult and important passage, § xx, 56—71, Dr Shadwell refers to 'the difficulty of finding authority for the belief that the moon approaches nearer to the earth in the southern hemisphere than in the north,' and adds that 'no explanation has yet been offered'; whereas Biagi calls attention to a passage in Pliny's *Natural History* which contains the astronomical blunder in question. Again the treatise contains two citations from Averroes. One is referred to the Commentary on the Third Book of the *De Anima*, and the other to the *De Substantia Orbis*. Both references are false. For the identification of the first passage Dr Shadwell has nothing better to offer us than a reference to the text of Aristotle *De Anima*, iii, 3, which is not Averroes, and which is only very vaguely to the purpose; whereas the *ipsissima verba* attributed to Averroes actually occur in his Commentary on the *Physics*, viii, 26. For the identification of the second passage Dr Shadwell follows Toynbee in the supposition that the author of the treatise had in mind a passage not of Averroes at all but of Albertus Magnus. But this passage is only in the loosest way applicable, whereas again the *ipsissima verba* attributed to Averroes occur in his Commentary on the *Metaphysics*, xii, 18. Both these identifications are to be made out (through a tangle of false references it is true) from Biagi's treatise, as was pointed out in the review of that work in this journal, Vol. iv, No. 2 (January, 1909).

Philip H. Wicksteed.

Childrey, Berks.

*Francesco Petrarca: Poet and Humanist.* By MAUD F. JERROLD. London: J. M. Dent & Co. 1909. viii + 350 pp.

In the publishers' puff preliminary it is claimed for this book, not only that it is 'the most important work on Petrarca yet published in the English language,' but also that 'it will take in England the place filled in France by Pierre de Nolhac's great work.' The first of these claims may possibly be allowed; but no one, we feel sure, who has even a cursory acquaintance with M. de Nolhac's epoch-making work, *Pétrarque et l'Humanisme*, which ranks as a classic of its kind, would for a moment dream of admitting the second. M. de Nolhac's book, as is well known to students, was the outcome of many years' arduous research, during which he examined some thousands of manuscripts in France and Italy for the purpose of tracing such as had been in Petrarch's possession, or had been copied or annotated by him, and of so determining what were the authors which he most closely studied; whereas, so far as we can discover, the writer of this book has not even so much as handled a manuscript, or made a single original contribution to the humanistic side of her subject. Against such an ill-advised and misleading claim as this of the publishers, which is calculated to create a prejudice at the outset against Mrs Jerrold's book, and which we can hardly suppose to have been made with her approval, we feel bound to enter an emphatic protest. In one respect, indeed, the comparison between the two books is unfair to Mrs Jerrold, for she has devoted a large proportion of her space to a careful study of Petrarch's poems, Italian and Latin, whereas M. de Nolhac, as the title of his work implies, is concerned almost exclusively with Petrarch the humanist. Mrs Jerrold's work is quite able to stand on its own merits, without any adventitious aid from advertisement.

The first four chapters of the book, together with chapters vii and ix—a somewhat awkward arrangement—deal with Petrarch's life, the main facts of which, literary and political, are now pretty well ascertained, and have lately been admirably retold in Mr Hollway-Calthrop's book on *Petrarch, His Life, Work, and Times*—a work which was reviewed recently in these pages, and of which, we note, no mention is made by Mrs Jerrold, even in her bibliography. Petrarch's relation to the troubadours is discussed at some length in the chapter entitled 'La joya de la violeta,' where we are given a good deal of detailed information about the lives of the troubadours, which would be appropriate enough in a commentary on the *Trionfi*, but is hardly in place in a biography of Petrarch. The attraction of Arnaut Daniel, the reputed inventor of the *sestina*, for both Dante and Petrarch, is not altogether easy for us to understand. Even in those days he had the reputation of being a 'difficult' poet—'las soas chanssons non son leus ad entendre ni ad aprendre,' writes the old Provençal biographer of him. Perhaps this very quality was the secret of his attraction. At any rate, Dante, in a well-known and often misunderstood passage in the *Purgatorio*, ranks him above all writers of 'versi d' amore e prose

di romanzi,' while Petrarch gives him the first place, as 'gran maestro d' amor,' among love-poets who were not natives of Italy. In her list of Provençal poets mentioned by Dante, Mrs Jerrold overlooks one of the most famous, viz., Bertran de Born. He is not mentioned by Petrarch in the *Trionfo d' Amore*, probably because his most congenial theme was war, not love, whence he was selected by Dante in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* as the representative 'singer of arms.' This same chapter contains an illuminating and sympathetic study of the *canzoniere*, the 'rerum vulgarium fragmenta,' as Petrarch himself somewhat affectedly entitled it. In the matter of the arrangement of the two parts of the *canzoniere*, a vexed question as to which the critics are sharply divided, Mrs Jerrold follows the most recent authorities in rejecting the time-honoured division into poems written before and after the death of Laura. The translations from the poems are as a rule well done, the renderings being spirited without being too free, but the ear is too often shocked by such false rhymes as 'breeze' and 'less,' 'light' and 'sit,' 'face' and 'loveliness,' and so on. We are surprised that M. de Nolhac's famous discovery of Petrarch's autograph copy of the *canzoniere* (Vatican MS. 3195) should not have been thought worthy of even passing mention by Mrs Jerrold. It was supposed until recently, by M. de Nolhac himself and other scholars that this MS. was the basis of the text of the first Aldine edition of 1501, which was produced under the direction of Cardinal Bembo (at one time the owner of the MS.); but the latest researches, as M. de Nolhac points out in a note in the second edition (1907) of his *Pétrarque et l'Humanisme*, have shown that this was not the case, the actual 'copy' used by Aldus having been another Vatican MS. (3197), which is in the hand not of Petrarch but of Bembo himself. As a matter of fact, Bembo does not appear to have become acquainted with Petrarch's autograph copy until as late as 1544. Mrs Jerrold is not quite accurate in her account of how these manuscripts passed into the possession of the Vatican. They were not 'presented' to the library by Fulvio Orsini (who had purchased them from Bembo's son), but came by bequest from Orsini in 1602, two years after his death, as is recorded in M. de Nolhac's *La Bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini*.

The second part of the *canzoniere* and the *Trionfi* (in regard to which the writer acknowledges her extensive obligations to unpublished studies of Mr Edmund Gardner) are dealt with at length in a later chapter. The accepted authority on the *Trionfi* is the critical edition of Herr Appel, whose conclusions as to the chronology and sequence of the cantos Mrs Jerrold briefly summarises. It is a little disconcerting to have these poems quoted by Latin titles, which smacks somewhat of pedantry, but there is good ground for supposing that Petrarch himself supplied these titles. The Latin poems and prose works are discussed in a chapter not very happily entitled 'In the footsteps of Cicero'; while the vast collection of letters, which consists of more than forty 'books,' has a chapter to itself. These chapters are enlivened by a series of extracts, in which Mrs Jerrold once again displays her

skill as a translator. We have not found Mrs Jerrold always a safe guide in this section of the book. Though M. de Nolhac's work on the *De Viris Illustribus* figures in the bibliography and is referred to in the notes, it does not appear to have been consulted to much purpose. For instance—to note but a single point—Mrs Jerrold is under the impression that the *De Viris Illustribus* has never been printed, though Razzolini's edition, which was published at Bologna in 1874–9, and which contains both the Latin text and the Italian translation of Donato degli Albanzani, is described at length and frequently quoted by M. de Nolhac.

The penultimate chapter of the work contains a brief but interesting survey of the influence of Petrarch in English literature. The statement in this chapter that Dante left more profound traces upon Chaucer than did Boccaccio will hardly, we imagine, be accepted without question by Chaucerian scholars. Mrs Jerrold is in error in stating that Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, presented his library to Balliol College. Duke Humphrey's gifts of books were made, at various periods, to the University of Oxford, which commemorated his munificence in the building over the Divinity School, still known as Duke Humphrey's Library.

Mrs Jerrold supplies a very full bibliography, which however is not so complete as it might be. Several works, for instance, of M. de Nolhac which ought to have been included do not figure here; and we think mention should have been made of the latest edition (1908) of the *canzoniere* with the notes of Rigutini and Scherillo. We have already noticed the omission of Mr Calthrop's book. On the other hand, the list is encumbered with a large number of unnecessary items relating to the works of English poets, which have no connection with the subject proper of the book. Some of the entries are not particularly intelligent. Mahn, for instance, is apparently credited with the authorship of the *Lives of the Troubadours* translated by Miss Farnell—an absurdity which is emphasised by the cross-reference from Farnell to Mahn on the previous page. Raynouard's name appears in the bibliography, and wherever it is mentioned elsewhere, as 'Raynouald'—a strange blunder on the part of a writer who professes acquaintance with Provençal literature. Similar carelessness in matters of detail is betrayed in the index, which is by no means free from misprints, and from which a great many names and references are omitted. There are only two references, for example, to M. de Nolhac, who is mentioned repeatedly in the book. But more or less mechanical defects of this kind do not seriously detract from the solid and often brilliant qualities of Mrs Jerrold's work, which, if it does not offer anything strikingly original to the student, at any rate deserves a warm welcome as an attempt to set before the English reader in an attractive form, and as the result of a close personal study, a conscientious estimate of Petrarch, humanist, 'politician,' and poet, by the light of the most recent researches of continental scholarship.

Paget Toynbee.

Burnham, Bucks.

## MINOR NOTICES.

Professor Franz's *Shakespeare-Grammatik*, of which a second edition now appears (Heidelberg, 1909: xxviii + 602 pp.), was first published in 1900, and at once took its place as the only scientific and satisfactory work on its subject. From the fact that the body of the book consisted then of 427 pages against the 602 of the new edition, it will be seen how much new matter has been included in the work before us. What that new matter is, is explained by Professor Franz in his Preface. He has added an Introduction which embodies the substance of his paper, *Die treibenden Kräfte im Werden der englischen Sprache* (1906), as well as sections on Elizabethan orthography, pronunciation and word-formation. The first of these is reprinted with slight alteration from a paper in *Die Neueren Sprachen* (1904), the third from a paper in *Englische Studien*, vol. xxxv, while the chapter on pronunciation is based on a paper *Orthographie, Lautgebung und Wortbildung in den Werken Shakespeares* (1905). In addition fifteen paragraphs of the Grammar are new, and a number of others have been enriched by new observations and examples. Statements in the first edition which on second thoughts appeared to the author unsatisfactory have now been removed from the text or rewritten. There has been some change also in the arrangement of the material. Professor Franz has taken advantage of all the serious criticism which his first edition encountered, and the result is a work which will be indispensable to every student of Shakespeare, and which will be a lasting monument to the learning, the unwearied industry and the acute observation of its author.

G. C. M. S.

Without claiming any very striking merits for Miss Alice I. Perry Wood's book, *The Stage History of Shakespeare's King Richard the Third* (Columbia University Studies in English, New York, 1909), we may agree with the Department of English in Columbia University that it is 'a contribution to knowledge worthy of publication.' The authoress is on the most difficult ground at the beginning of her work, when she attempts to give *Richard III* its place in relation to contemporary plays, and discusses its presentation on the Elizabethan stage. Her later chapters trace the stage history of the play in England from the Restoration to 1897. Here she has merely to add touches from other authorities to the account given by Genest. Her last chapter deals with the stage history of the play in America, and this to English readers will be the freshest part of the work. Other pages of interest are those which deal with 'favourite situations' in the pre-Shakespearian Chronicle plays. No one can give a history of the performances of a particular play from the seventeenth to the end of the nineteenth century without throwing a good deal of light on the general history of

the stage and of the actor's different conceptions of his art during the period. Miss Wood's monograph from this point of view will be instructive to all who do not know the tale too well. Her style is clear and unpretentious. It is a pity, however, that the Department of English of Columbia University did not suggest to her to remove some rather glaring errors, as when she dates Milton's *Eikonoclastes* '1690' (p. 4), speaks of Lodge and Peele as Cambridge men who must therefore have been familiar with Legge's *Richardus Tertius* (p. 6), and says that in 1698 Jeremy *Taylor* 'lashed the immorality of the contemporary stage' (p. 96). She expresses the extraordinary opinion (p. 3) that 'a kingdom for stage' in *Henry V* is 'Shakespeare's own imitation of "a kingdom for a horse."' A sentence on p. 57 defies emendation: 'In "Henry the Fifth" the scenes in which Henry does not appear are either comic or more important by the figure of Henry the Fourth.' The date of the performance of Legge's *Richardus Tertius,* though often given as here (p. 5) '1579,' should be '$15\frac{79}{80}$.'

G. C. M. S.

A very useful purpose should be served by Mr O. T. Williams' *Short Extracts from Old English Poetry, chiefly for Unseen Translation* (Bangor: Jarvis and Foster, 1909), seeing how comparatively inaccessible are the chief Old English poetical texts, apart from *Beowulf* and those to be found in Anglo-Saxon readers. The choice of extracts seems to be a wise one under the self-imposed limitations of the editor, viz., that the passages selected should be representative of Old English Christian poetry. One cannot but regret, however, that those limitations are laid down. There is little doubt that for most readers of Anglo-Saxon the poetry which is not distinctively Christian is of equal if not of greater interest. Some examples of the riddles, one or two of the charms, an extract or two from *Widsith* or *Deor* or *Waldhere* would serve just as useful a purpose so far as translation is concerned, and would have the additional merit of introducing the student to the customs and manners of our English forefathers, and telling them something of the legends and stories current among them. This is an aspect of Old English poetry which is far too much neglected at the present time.

The text is satisfactory; not a normalised one, and embodying only such emendations as are absolutely necessary. There are a few notes, concerned chiefly with the text, and a glossary of the less familiar words. The printing is good, except for the capital Ð, which is unduly heavy in type, and stands out unpleasantly on almost every page.

A. M.

A rather voluminous work on *Du Bartas en Angleterre,* by H. Ashton (Paris, É. Larose, 1908), written in pleasant French, for the 'doctorat d'université,' is a very disappointing performance. It is divided into three parts, which deal respectively with the life and fame

of Du Bartas, the life of Sylvester and the value of his translations, and lastly the influence exercised in England by the Huguenot poet. Excepting an interesting communication from the assistant-librarian of the Royal Library of Copenhagen which disposes of Du Bartas' reported journey to Denmark in the retinue of James VI, the first part of the thesis adds practically nothing to the information furnished by G. Pellissier's dissertation and by the introduction to O. de Gourcuff's *Choix de poésies* (Auch, 1890). It also contains several minor errors and a number of omissions, and the author's conclusions are seriously invalidated in that he fails to discriminate between the relative importance of Du Bartas' numerous admirers in France and England. In the second part Mr Ashton, who appears not to have known of P. Weller's excellent dissertation (*Joshua Sylvesters englische Übersetzungen der religiösen Epen des Du Bartas*, Strassburg, 1902), has done badly what his German predecessor did well. In the last section, which treats of the influence of Du Bartas in England, Mr Ashton is plainly unprepared for his task; he only deals with Du Bartas' influence on Milton (following, save for *Paradise Lost*, closely in the footsteps of Dunster's antiquated essay), and on William Browne. Not a word is said concerning Du Bartas' influence on Drayton (*Moyses in a Map of Miracles*), Phineas Fletcher (*Purple Island*), William Alexander (*Doomesday*), Drummond of Hawthornden (some of the longer pieces, particularly in the *Flowers of Sion*), etc. The present essay compares very unfavourably with the average dissertation for the 'doctorat d'université,' and one wonders how it secured official acceptance.

L. E. K.

*Dante e la Lunigiana* (Milan, Hoepli, 1909) is the first of a pair of volumes projected by the committee for the commemoration of the sixth centenary of Dante's visit to the Valdimagra, three years ago. The present volume, clearly printed and profusely illustrated, is a worthy product of that gathering. Among its thirteen contributors figure the well-known names of Del Lungo, D'Ancona, Rajna and Vandelli; a pledge of solid material for study. A companion volume is promised shortly, in which the relations of Dante with the House of Malaspina are to be set out in full. Meanwhile we have here a most interesting collection of essays on various topics connected with the Lunigiana of Dante's day, grouped round Del Lungo's commemorative oration delivered on the spot in 1906. Of special interest is Rajna's facsimile and transcript of the famous 'Letter of Frate Ilario,' and his remarks thereon. A facsimile is also given of Dante's 'Epistle to Moroello Malaspina' (from the Vatican MS.); and of a fragmentary Codex of the *Divina Commedia*, written in Florence (so Prof. Vandelli judges) in the middle of the fourteenth century, and discovered twenty years ago by Prof. Achille Neri (one of the contributors to this volume) in the *Archivio Notarile* at Sarzana.

L. R.

# NEW PUBLICATIONS.

## November, 1909—January, 1910.

### GENERAL.

Armas, J. de, Ensayos críticos de Literatura inglesa y española. Madrid, V. Suárez. 4 pes.

Busse, B., Das Drama. I. Von der Antike zum französischen Klassizismus. (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt, 287.) Leipzig, Teubner. 1 M.

Landau, M., Hölle und Fegfeuer in Volksglaube, Dichtung und Kirchenlehre. Heidelberg, Winter. 4 M.

Reimarus Secundus, Geschichte der Salome von Cato bis O. Wilde. III. Herodias von Matthaeus bis Wilde. Leipzig, Wigand. 3 M.

Saunders, W., Ancient Handwritings. An Introductory Manual for intending students. London, Simpkin, Marshall. 4*s.* net.

### ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

**General.**

Bibliotheca romanica. 91. G. Leopardi, Prose, Pensieri. 92. P. Corneille, Le Menteur. 93. G. Boccaccio, Decameron, ix. 94—5. Brunetto Latino, Il tesoretto e il favoletto. 96—8. H. de Balzac, Le cabinet des antiques. 99—100. G. Boccaccio, Decameron, x. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. Each no. 40 pf.

Meyer-Lübke, W., Einführung in das Studium der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft. 2. Aufl. (Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, i, i.) Heidelberg, Winter. 5 M.

**Latin.**

Norlind, T., Latinska Skolsänger i Sverige och Finland. (Lunds universitets Aarskrift, v, ii.) Lund, Gleerup. 3 Kr.

**Italian.**

Cicchitelli, V., Sulle opere in prosa di M. G. Vida. Naples, Tip. Sannitica. 2 L.

Dante Alighieri, Quaestio de Aqua et Terra. Edited and translated by C. L. Shadwell. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Dante Alighieri, The Trilogy; or Dante's Three Visions. Translated by J. W. Thomas. 3 vols. London, Calley. 3*s.* net.

Gabriele, M. da Aleppo, e G. M. Calvaruso, Le fonti arabiche nel dialetto siciliano. i. Rome, Loescher. 25 L.

Lee, A. C., The Decameron, its Sources and Analogues. London, Nutt. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Martines, I., La donna nella vita e nelle opere di V. Alfieri. Mistretta, Tip. del Progresso. 2 L.

Mascetta-Caracci, L., Dante e il 'Dedalo' Petrarchesco con uno studio sulla malattia del Petrarcha. Lanciano, Carabba. 8 L.

Massarani, T., Studi letterari e artistici. Gruppo II, vol. 2, 3; Gruppo III, vol. 3—5. Florence, Le Monnier. Each 4 L.

Novella, La, della figliuola del mercatante. Faksimile eines um 1500 in Florenz hergestellten Druckes. Erlangen, M. Mencke. 2 M.

Porta, M. T., Madame de Staël e l' Italia. Florence, Gonnelli. 2 L. 50.

Sabersky, H., Das Verhältnis des Italieners zu seiner Landsprache aus De Amicis, l' idioma gentile. 2 Vorträge. (Romanische Studien, IX.) Berlin, Ebering. 2 M.

Settembrini, L., Scritti inediti a cura di F. Torraca. Naples, Soc. commerciale Libr. 4 L.

Tommasini, M. P., Il pensiero di C. Cattaneo e di G. Mazzini nelle poesie di G. Carducci. Saggio critico. Città di Castello, S. Lapi. 2 L. 50.

Wiley, S. K., Dante and Beatrice. London, Macmillan. 5*s.* net.

Willert, M., Dante Alighieri und seine Zeit. Eine Einführung. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 2 M.

**Spanish.**

Bonsoms y Sicart, I., Fragmentos de las traducciones catalanas de la 'Fiameta' y del 'Decamerone' de Boccaccio, ambas anónimas y del siglo XV. Barcelona, Imp. de la Casa Provincial de Caridad.

Catalina, M., La Poesiá en el teatro antiguo, colección de trozos escogidos. Tomo I. Madrid, Tip. de la 'Revista de Archivos.'

Díaz de Escovar, N., Algunos datos sobre el antiguo autor de comedias Alonso de Olmedo. Madrid, Imp. Helénica.

Foulché-Delbosc, R., Bibliographie hispanique, 1905, 1906. New York, Hispanic Society. Each, 1 dol. 25.

García de la Riega, C., Literatura galaica. El Amadis de Gaula. Madrid, E. Arias. 3 pes.

Le Gentil, G., Le poète Manuel Breton de Los Herreros et la société espagnole de 1830 à 1860. Paris, Hachette, 10 fr.

Le Gentil, G., Les revues littéraires de l'Espagne pendant la première moitié du XIX^e^ siècle, aperçu bibliographique. Paris, Hachette. 5 fr.

Rittwagen, G., De Filología hispano-arábiga. Ensayo crítico. Madrid, Lib. de F. Fé. 4 pes.

Rojas, F. de, The Celestina. Facsimile of the first known edition, Burgos, 1499. New York, Hispanic Society.

Tirso de Molina, Entremeses del siglo XVII atribuídos al. Con una epístola histórica crítica por el Bachiller Mantuano [A. Bonilla y San Martin]. Madrid, B. Rodríguez. 2 pes.

Valera, J., Obras completas. XX. Crítica literaria (1857–60). Madrid, Imp. Alemana.

**Provençal.**

Wehowski, E., Die Sprache der Vida de la benaurada sancta Doncelina. Lautstand, Formen und einige syntaktische Erscheinungen. Eine Studie zum Dialekt von Marseille. (Romanische Studien, viii.) Berlin, Ebering. 4 M. 50.

**French.**

(*a*) *General* (*Language*).

Brunot, F., Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900. Tome iii. Paris, A. Colin. 12 fr. 50.

Konta, A. L., The History of French Literature from the Oaths of Strassburg to Chanticler. New York, Appleton. 2 dol. 50 net.

Paris, G., Mélanges linguistiques, publ. par Mario Roques. Fasc. 4. Notes étymologiques, appendice. Paris, H. Champion. 6 fr.

Plan, Ph., Choix de gallicismes et d'expressions figurées du français parlé. Préf. de F. F. Roget. Paris, Kischbacher. 3 fr. 50.

(*b*) *Old French.*

Bodel, Jean, Saxenlied, ii. Herausg. von E. Stengel. (Ausgaben und Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der roman. Phil., c.) Marburg, Elwert. 5 M.

Luns, F., Over het ontstaan van het Fransche drama en zijn ontwikkeling in den loop der middeleeuwen. Amsterdam, Losco-uitgaaf. 1 fl. 40.

Luquiens, F. B., An Introduction to Old French Phonology and Morphology. New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press. 1 dol. net.

Simund de Freine, Œuvres, publ. d'après tous les textes manuscrits connus par John E. Matzke. Paris, Firmin-Didot. 10 fr.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

Augé-Chiquet, M., La vie, les idées et l'œuvre de J. A. de Baïf. Paris, Hachette. 15 fr.

Augé-Chiquet, M., Les amours de J. A. de Baïf (Amours de Méline). Édition critique. Paris, Hachette. 6 fr.

Barbey d'Aurevilly, J., Critiques diverses. Paris, Lemerre. 3 fr. 50.

Cagnac, M., Fénelon, études critiques. Paris, Soc. fr. d'impr. et de libr. 3 fr. 50.

Champion, E., J. J. Rousseau et la Révolution française. Paris, A. Colin. 3 fr. 50.

Crucé, Emeric. Le novveau Cynée. Reprinted from the original edition of 1623. With English translation and introduction by T. W. Balch. Philadelphia, Allen, Lane and Scott. 2 dol.

Drouhet, Ch., Le poète F. Mainard, 1583—1646. Étude d'histoire littéraire. Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.

Garborg, H., Rousseau og hans Tanker i Nutiden. Christiania, Gyldendal. 3 Kr. 50.

Guillemot, J., L'évolution de l'idée dramatique chez les maîtres du théâtre De Corneille à Dumas fils. Paris, Perrin. 3 fr. 50.

Harispe, P., Lamennais et Gerbet. i. Paris, Soc. d'édit. fr. et étr. 5 f.

Jordan, H. R., Blaise Pascal: a study of religious Psychology. London, Williams and Norgate. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Lauvrière, É., Alfred de Vigny. Sa vie et ses œuvres. Paris, Colin. 4 fr.

Malherbe, F. de. Les Chefs-d'œuvre lyriques. 2 parts. Glasgow, Gowans and Gray. Each 6*d.* net.

Martin-Dupont, N., François Rabelais. Paris, A. Michel. 5 fr.

Michaut, G., Senancour, ses amis et ses ennemis. Études et documents. Paris, E. Sansot. 7 fr. 50.

Montaigne, M. de, Gesammelte Schriften. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe. III. Munich, Müller. 5 M.

Monnet, C., Projet de bibliographie lamartinienne française-italienne. Turin, S. Lattes e C. 4 L.

Musset, A. de, Lettres d'amour à Aimée d'Alton (Mme Paul de Musset), 1837—1848, suivies de poésies inédites, introduction, notes par L. Séché. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Nonnenberg-Chun, M., Der französische Philhellenismus in den zwanziger Jahren des vorigen Jahrhunderts. (Romanische Studien, x.) Berlin, Ebering. 6 M.

Pfandl, L., H. Lucas: sein Leben und seine dramatischen Werke. Munich, Buchholz.

Ravà, B., L'art de Rabelais. Rome, Loescher. 4 L.

Reure, O. C., La vie et les œuvres d'Honoré d'Urfé. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 5 fr.

Rouchon, V., Le théâtre au Puy à la fin du XVIII^e^ siècle. Paris, Champion. 2 fr.

Rousseau, J. J., Correspondance avec L. Usteri. Publiée par P. Usteri et E. Ritter. Zürich, Beer und Co. 3 fr.

Rousseau, J. J., La première rédaction des 'Confessions,' publ. d'après le manuscrit autografe. Genève, A. Jullien. 7 fr. 50.

Roustan, M., La littérature française par la dissertation. Tome I. Le XVIII^e^ siècle. Paris, Delaplane. 3 fr.

Ruxton, G., La Dilecta de Balzac. Balzac et Mme de Berny, 1820—36. Préface de J. Lemaître. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 3 fr. 50.

Scarron, P., Le roman comique. Nouv. édit. Paris, Garnier. 3 fr.

Schoen, H., F. Coppée, l'homme et le poète. Paris, Fischbacher. 2 fr.

Séché, A. et J. Bertant, Diderot. Paris, Michaud. 2 fr. 25.

Séché, L., Muses romantiques. Madame d'Arbouville d'après sa correspondance inédite avec Sainte-Beuve. Paris, Mercure de France. 7 fr. 50.

Steinweg, C., Racine. Kompositionsstudien zu seinen Tragödien. Halle, Niemeyer. 8 M.

Sugier, E., Lamartine, étude morale. Paris, Fischbacher. 3 fr. 50.

Tesdorpf, P., Beiträge zur Würdigung Ch. Perrault's und seiner Märchen. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 2 M.

Voltaire, F. de, Lettres Philosophiques, édition critique par G. Lanson. II. Paris, E. Cornéley. 5 fr.

Wolff, M. J., Molière. Der Dichter und sein Werk. Munich, C. H. Beck. 9 M.

## GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

### Scandinavian.

Berge, R., Norsk folkedigtning med opskrifter fra S. Bugges utrykte samlinger. I. Christiania, Gyldendal. 4 Kr. 50.

Kierkegaard, S., Gesammelte Werke. Neue Auflage. III. und XII. Bd. Jena, Diederichs. Each 3 M.

Monrad, O. P., S. Kierkegaard, sein Leben und seine Werke. Jena, Diederichs. 2 M. 50.

Paludan-Müller, F., Poetiske Skrifter i Udvalg. Udgivet i Anledning af Hundredaarsfesten. 3 Bind. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 7 Kr. 50.

Reich, E., H. Ibsens Dramen. 7. und 8. Auflage. Berlin, S. Fischer. 3 M. 50.

Rémundar Saga Keisarsonar. Utg. for Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Litteratur af S. G. Broberg. 1. hefte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 3 Kr. 50.

Rimnasafn. Samling af de ældste islandske Rimer. Udgivet for Samfund af gammel nordisk Litteratur ved F. Jónsson. 4. hefte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 2 Kr.

Rønning, F., N. F. S. Gruntvig. Et Bidrag til Skildring af Dansk Aandsliv i det 19. Aarhundrede, II, ii. Copenhagen. Schønberg. 3 Kr.

Þidriks Saga af Bern. Udg. for Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nord. Litteratur ved H. Bertelsen. 4. hefte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 5 Kr.

Woerner, R., Henrik Ibsen. II (1873—1906). Munich, C. H. Beck. 8 M.

### Dutch.

Hoog, W. de, Studiën over de Nederlandsche en Engelsche taal- en letterkunde en haar wederzijdschen invloed. 2. uitg. Dordrecht, J. P. Revers. 5 fl. 50.

Kalff, G., Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche letterkunde. V. Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 6 fl. 50.

Mootenaar, D., en H. Poort, Nederlandsche verskunst. Kritische studiën. I. Zeist, M. Borgaerdt. 1 fl. 90.

### English.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Language*).

Dictionary of National Biography, edited by S. Lee. XXI, XXII (Supplement). London, Smith, Elder. Each 15*s.* net.

Kaluza, M., Englische Metrik in historischer Entwickelung. (Normannia, I.) Berlin, Felber. 7 M.

Mutschmann, H., A Phonology of the North-Eastern Scotch Dialect on an historical basis. (Bonner Studien, I.) Bonn, P. Hanstein. 3 M.

New English Dictionary. Romanity—Roundness (Vol. VIII), by W. A. Craigie. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Verrier, P., Essais sur les principes de la métrique anglaise. Tome III. Paris, Welter. 25 fr.

Williams, I., Phonetics for Scottish Students. Glasgow, Maclehose. 2*s.* net.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

Fehlauer, F., Die englischen Übersetzungen von Boethius' 'De Consolatione philosophiae.' (Normannia, II.) Berlin, Felber. 3 M.

Garrett, R. M., Precious stones in Old English Literature. (Münchener Beiträge zur roman. und engl. Phil., XLVII.) Leipzig, Deichert. 3 M. 25.

(*c*) *Modern English.*

Addleshaw, P., Sir Philip Sidney. New York, Putnam; London, Methuen. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Aldis, H. G., The Book-trade, 1557—1625. Cambridge, University Press.

Arnold, M., Poems, 1840-67. With Introduction by A. T. Quiller-Couch. (Oxford Edition.) London, Frowde. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Ballweg, O., Das klassizistische Drama zur Zeit Shakespeares. (Beiträge zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, I.) Heidelberg, Winter. 3 M.

Barrie, J. M., George Meredith, 1909. London, Constable. 1*s.* net.

Beaumont, F. and J. Fletcher, Works. Vol. VII. (Cambridge English Classics.) London, Frowde. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Brandl, A., The Cock in the North. Poetische Weissagung auf Percy Hotspur. (Aus Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.) Berlin, Reimer. 1 M.

Brereton, J. Le Gay, Elizabethan Drama. Notes and Studies. Sydney, W. Brooks and Co.

Broadley, A. M., Dr Johnson and Mrs Thrale, including Mrs Thrale's unpublished Journal of the Welsh Tour made in 1774. London, Lane. 16*s.* net.

Burton, R., Masters of the English Novel. A Study of Principles and Personalities. New York. H. Holt and Co. 1 dol. 25.

Campion, Th., Works, ed. by P. Vivian. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Courthope, W. J., A History of English Poetry. Vol. VI. The Romantic Movement. Effects of the French Revolution. London, Macmillan. 10*s.* net.

D'Avenant, Sir W., Love and Honour and the Siege of Rhodes. Edited by J. W. Tupper. (Belles-Lettres Series.) Boston, D. C. Heath; London, Harrap. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Deckner, E., Die beiden ersten Hamlet-Quartos. (Normannia, IV.) Berlin, Felber. 1 M. 50.

Eighteenth Century Literature. An Oxford Miscellany. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 4*s.* net.

English Parnassus. An Anthology of Longer Poems. Edited by W. Macneile Dixon and H. J. C. Grierson. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Fleay, F. G., A Chronicle History of the London Stage, 1559—1642. (Anastatic reprint.) New York, Stechert. 6 dol. net.

Franke, W., Der Stil in den epischen Dichtungen Walter Scotts. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 3 M.

Godden, G. M., Henry Fielding. A memoir. London, Sampson Low. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Goldsmith, O., Plays, together with The Vicar of Wakefield. Edited by C. E. Doble. (Oxford Edition.) London, Frowde. 2*s.*

HARRIS, F., The Man Shakespeare and his Tragic Life Story. London, F. Palmer. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

HORN, K., Studien zum dichterischen Entwicklungsgang D. G. Rossetti's. (Normannia, v.) Berlin, Felber. 3 M. 50.

KEATS, J., Poems published in 1820. Edited with Introduction and Notes by M. Robertson. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3*s.* 6*d.*

KER, W. P., Tennyson. The Leslie Stephen Lecture, 1909. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 1*s.* net.

LOBBAN, J. H., Dr Johnson's Mrs Thrale: Autobiography, Letters and Literary Remains of Mrs Piozzi, edited by A. Hayward. Newly selected and edited. Edinburgh, Foulis. 6*s.* net.

NEWMAN, J. H., The Dream of Gerontius. With a complete facsimile of the original fair copy and of portions of the first rough draft. London, Longmans. 31*s.* 6*d.* net.

PEACOCK, T. L., Memoirs of Shelley, with Shelley's Letters to Peacock. Edited by H. F. B. Brett-Smith. London, H. Frowde. 2*s.* 6*d.*

POLLARD, A. W., Shakespeare Folios and Quartos. A Study in the bibliography of Shakespeare's plays, 1594—1686. London, Methuen. 21*s.* net.

POPE, A., The Rape of the Lock. Edited by G. Holden. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

PRAED, W. M., Select Poems. Edited by A. D. Godley. London, H. Frowde. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

PUTSCHI, F., Charles Churchhill, sein Leben und seine Werke. (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, XXXI.) Vienna, Braumüller. 3 M. 40.

REYNOLDS, M., The Treatment of Nature in English Poetry between Pope and Wordsworth. 2nd ed. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press. 2 dol. 50 net.

SHAKESPEARE in deutscher Sprache. Herausg. und zum Teil neu übersetzt von F. Gundolf. III. Berlin, Bondi. 6 M.

SHELLEY, P. B., The Cenci. Edited by G. E. Woodberry. (Belles-Lettres Series.) Boston, D. C. Heath; London, Harrap. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

SHELLEY, P. B., Literary and Philosophical Criticism. Edited with introduction by John Shawcross. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2*s.* 6*d.*

SICHEL, W., Sheridan. 2 vols. London, Constable. 31*s.* 6*d.* net.

SIDGWICK, A., Tennyson. London, Sidgwick and Jackson. 1*s.* net.

SMITH, A., Poetical Works. Edited with critical and biographical introduction by W. Sinclair. Edinburgh, W. P. Nimmo. 2*s.* net.

SOUTHEY, R., Poems. Edited by M. H. Fitzgerald. (Oxford Edition.) London, Frowde. 2*s.*

TEMPLE, SIR W., Essays on Ancient and Modern Learning and on Poetry. Edited by J. E. Spingarn. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

THACKERAY, W. M., Selections, edited by G. K. Chesterton. (Masters of Literature.) London, G. Bell and Son. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

WACKWITZ, F., Entstehungsgeschichte von Defoe's 'Robinson Crusoe.' Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 1 M. 50.

WARD, A. W. and A. R. WALLER, The Cambridge History of English Literature. Vol. IV. Cambridge, University Press. 9*s.* net.

WOLFF, L., John Keats, sa vie et son œuvre. Paris, Hachette. 10 fr.

Wölk, K., Geschichte und Kritik des englischen Hexameters. (Normannia, III.) Berlin, Felber. 3 M.

Ziegenrücker, E., Joanna Baillie's 'Plays on the Passions.' Rostock, Warkentien. 2 M.

**German.**

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Language*).

Reis, H., Die Mundarten des Grossherzogtums Hessen. Laut- und Formenlehre. (Aus 'Zeitschrift für deutsche Mundarten.') Halle, Buchh. des Waisenhauses. 3 M.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters. Herausg. von der kgl. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften. XV. Die Lilie, eine mittelfränkische Dichtung in Reimprosa und andere geistliche Gedichte aus der Wiesbadener Hs. herausg. von P. Wüst. XVII. Kleinere mittelhochdeutsche Erzählungen, Fabeln und Lehrgedichte. 3. Die Heidelberger Hs. cod. Pal. germ. 341. Herausg. von G. Rosenhagen. Berlin, Weidmann. 4 M. 60 and 10 M. 60.

Eckehart, Meister, Schriften und Predigten. Übersetzt und herausgegeben von H. Büttner. Vol. II. Jena, Diederichs. 5 M.

Habel, E., Der deutsche Cornutus. II. Der Novus Cornutus des Otto von Lüneburg. In den deutschen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters zum ersten Male herausg. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 1 M. 20.

Habermann, P., Die Metrik der kleineren althochdeutschen Reimgedichte. Halle, Niemeyer. 7 M.

Liederhandschrift, Die grosse Heidelberger. In getreuem Textabdruck herausg. von F. Pfaff. I. Teil. Heidelberg, Winter. 23 M.

Petersen, J., Das Rittertum in der Darstellung des Johannes Rothe. (Quellen und Forschungen, 106.) Strassburg, Trübner. 5 M.

Seidl, O., Der Schwan von der Salzach. Nachahmung und Motivmischung bei dem Pleier. Dortmund, Ruhfus. 2 M.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Arndt, E. M., Werke. Kleine Auswahl in 6 Bänden. Herausg. von H. Meisner und R. Geerds. Leipzig, Hesse. 3 M.

Berger, A. E., Ein Schiller-Denkmal. Drei Vorträge. Berlin, E. Hofmann. 1 M.

Bierbaum, O. J., Liliencron. 2. Aufl. Munich, Müller. 3 M. 50.

Bithell, J., Contemporary German Poetry. Selected and translated. London, W. Scott. 1*s*.

Bode, K., Die Bearbeitung der Vorlagen in Des Knaben Wunderhorn. (Palaestra, 76.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 20 M.

Bode, W., Charlotte von Stein. Berlin, Mittler und Sohn. 7 M. 50.

Döll, A., Goethes Mitschuldigen. (Bausteine zur Geschichte der neueren deutschen Literatur, III.) Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.

Döll, O., Die Entwicklung der naturalistischen Form im jüngst-deutschen Drama (1880–90). Halle, Gesenius. 3 M.

Droste-Hülshoff, A. von, Sämtliche Werke in 6 Bänden. Herausg. von E. Arens. Leipzig, Hesse. 3 M.

FONTANE, TH., Briefe. Zweite Sammlung. Herausg. von O. Pniower und P. Schlenther. 2 Bände. Berlin, Fontane. 10 M.

FREILIGRATH, F., Briefe. Herausg. von L. Wiens, geb. Freiligrath. Stuttgart, Cotta. 3 M. 50.

GEIGER, L., Goethe. Sein Leben und Schaffen. Berlin, Ullstein und Co. 6 M.

GOEHLER, R., Die deutsche Schillerstiftung, 1859—1909. Eine Jubiläumsschrift. 2 Bände. Berlin, A. Duncker. 16 M.

GOETHE, J. W. VON, Werke. Herausg. im Auftrage der Grossherzogin Sophie von Sachsen. IV, 44, 47, 48. (Briefe, 1828–31.) Weimar, Böhlau. 7 M. 40; 6 M. 80; 5 M. 60.

GOETHE, J. W. VON, Werke. Im Auftrage der Goethe-Gesellschaft ausgewählt und herausg. von E. Schmidt. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 6 M.

GOETHE, J. W. VON, Sämtliche Werke in 30 Bänden. Herausg. von M. Heimann. VI. Leipzig, Tempel-Verlag. 3 M.

GOETHE, J. W. VON, Faust. In sämtlichen Fassungen herausg. von K. Alt. (Goldene Klassiker-Bibliothek.) Berlin, Bong und Co. 2 M. 50.

GOETHE, J. W. VON, Gespräche. Gesamtausgabe. 2. Aufl. Herausg. von F. von Biedermann. II. Leipzig, Biedermann. 4 M.

HEINE, H., Sämtliche Werke in 10 Bänden. IX. Herausg. von O. Walzel. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 2 M.

HEINE, H., Sämtliche Werke. Herausg. von R. Unger. I—II. Leipzig, Tempel-Verlag. Each 3 M.

HÖNES, TH., Th. G. von Hippel. Bonn, C. Georgi. 1 M. 20.

JANENTZKY, C., G. A. Bürgers Aesthetik. (Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, XXXVII.) Berlin, A. Duncker. 8 M.

KASCH, F., L. F. G. von Goeckingk. (Beiträge zur deutschen Literaturwissenschaft, V.) Marburg, Elwert. 3 M. 20.

KLEIST, H. VON, Sämtliche Werke in sechs Bänden. Herausg. von W. Herzog. I. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 4 M. 50.

KLEIST, H. VON, Sämtliche Werke in fünf Bänden. Herausg. von A. Eloesser. Leipzig, Tempel-Verlag. III, IV. Each 3 M.

KREBS, S., Ph. O. Runge's Entwicklung unter dem Einfluss L. Tiecks. (Beiträge zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, IV.) Heidelberg, Winter. 4 M. 40.

KREMER, J., Das Problem der Theodicee in der Philosophie und Literatur des 18. Jahrh. mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Kant und Schiller. (Kantstudien, XIII.) Berlin, Reuther und Reichard. 7 M. 50.

KÜRNBERGER, F., Gesammelte Schriften. Herausg. von O. E. Deutsch. I. Munich, G. Müller. 6 M.

LAUREMBERG, J., Scherzgedichte in handschriftlicher Fassung. (Drucke des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung, V.) Norden, Soltau. 1 M.

LEBEDE, H., Tiecks Novelle 'Der Aufruhr in den Cevennen.' Eine literarhistorische Untersuchung. Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.

LENZ, J. M. R., Gesammelte Schriften. Herausg. von E. Lewy. II, III. Berlin, Cassirer. 3 M. and 5 M. 50.

LORENTZ, P., Lessings Philosophie. Denkmäler aus der Zeit des Kampfes zwischen Aufklärung und Humanität. (Philosophische Bibliothek, CXIX.) Leipzig, Dürr. 4 M. 50.

MEINHOLD, P., Arndt. (Geisteshelden, LVIII.) Berlin, E. Hofmann und Co. 2 M. 40.

MERCK, J. H., Schriften und Briefwechsel. In Auswahl herausg. von K. Wolff. 2 Bände. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 14 M.

MEYER, F., Verzeichnis einer H. Heine-Bibliothek. II. Leipzig, Dyk. 6 M.

MICHAEL, W., Überlieferung und Reihenfolge der Gedichte Höltys. (Bausteine zur Geschichte der neueren deutschen Literatur, II.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.

PERGER, A., System der dramatischen Technik mit besonderer Untersuchung von Grabbes Drama. Berlin, Duncker. 10 M.

RICHERT, J., Geschichte der Lyrik Justinus Kerners. (Berliner Beiträge zur german. und roman. Phil., XXXVI.)

RIEMANN, E., Nordfriesland in der erzählenden Dichtung seit Anfang des 19. Jahrh. (Probefahrten, XVI.) Leipzig, Voigtländer. 4 M. 80.

SCHAEFFER, C., Die Bedeutung des Musikalischen und Akustischen in E. T. A. Hoffmanns literarischem Schaffen. (Beiträge zur deutschen Literaturwissenschaft, XVIII.) Marburg, Elwert. 6 M.

SCHMIDT, E., Lessing. Geschichte seines Lebens und seiner Schriften. 2 Bände. 3. Aufl. Berlin, Weidmann. 20 M.

SCHMIDTBORN, O., C. E. von Houwald als Dramatiker. (Beiträge zur deutschen Literaturwissenschaft, VIII.) Marburg, Elwert. 2 M. 40.

SCHULTZ, F., Der Verfasser der Nachtwachen von Bonaventura. Untersuchungen zur deutschen Romantik. Berlin, Weidmann. 8 M.

STAHL, H., P. Martin von Cochem und das 'Leben Christi.' Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der religiösen Volksliteratur. (Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte und Kulturgeschichte des Rheinlandes, II.) Bonn, P. Hanstein. 4 M. 50.

VOLKMANN, O. F., Wilhelm Busch der Poet. Seine Motive und seine Quellen. (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte, V.) Leipzig. Haessel. 2 M.

WALLBERG, E., Hebbels Stil in seinen ersten Tragödien 'Judith' und 'Genoveva.' Berlin, Behr. 4 M.

WERNAER, R. M., Romanticism and the Romantic School in Germany. New York, Appleton. 2 dol. net.

WIELAND, C. M., Gesammelte Schriften. Herausg. von der kgl. preuss. Akademie, I, 2; II, 2. Berlin, Weidmann. 9 M. and 12 M.